3 1761 02092252 2

EMMANUEL

THE LIBRARY
of
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY
Toronto

MISSIONS AND MODERN HISTORY

WORKS BY
ROBERT E. SPEER

MISSIONARY PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE.
A Discussion of Christian Missions and some Criticisms upon them. 8vo, cloth, net $1.50.

THE PRINCIPLES OF JESUS.
As applied to some Questions of to-day. 16mo, cloth, net 80c.

CHRIST AND LIFE.
Papers on the Practice of the Christian Life. 16mo, cloth, net $1.00.

REMEMBER JESUS CHRIST.
And other talks about Christ and the Christian Life. Long 16mo, cloth, 75c.

STUDIES OF THE MAN CHRIST JESUS.
Twelfth Thousand. Long 16mo, cloth, 75c.

STUDIES OF THE MAN PAUL.
Uniform with the Man Christ Jesus. Long 16mo, cloth, 75c.

MISSIONS AND POLITICS IN ASIA.
Studies of the Spirit of the Eastern peoples, the present making of history in Asia, and the part therein of Christian Missions. Student's Lectures on Missions, Princeton, 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

A MEMORIAL OF A TRUE LIFE.
A Biography of HUGH MCALLISTER BEAVER. With Portrait. 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

GAMBLING AND BETTING.
A Frank Talk to Young Men of To-day, paper, net 10c.

THE SITUATION IN CHINA.
A Record of Cause and Effect. 12mo, paper, net 10c.

FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY
NEW YORK CHICAGO TORONTO

MISSIONS AND MODERN HISTORY

A Study of the Missionary Aspects of Some Great Movements of the Nineteenth Century

By
ROBERT E. SPEER
Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

In two volumes

VOL. I

NEW YORK CHICAGO TORONTO
Fleming H. Revell Company
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

BV
2120
S7
V.1

EMMANUEL

Copyright, 1904, by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
Chicago: 63 Washington Street
Toronto: 27 Richmond Street, W
London: 21 Paternoster Square
Edinburgh: 30 St. Mary Street

To my associate
F. F. Ellinwood, D. D., LL. D.,
with an admiration
for his scholarship, sound judgment and
unselfish purity of character
which the intimacy of years
has steadily heightened,
and with a truly filial love

Preface

THOSE who desire a complete preface to this book may turn to the concluding chapter. Some of the great principles involved in the movements which are discussed in these pages are there drawn forth. It must suffice here to say that there are no principles which it is more important for the world in this day clearly to understand.

I am grateful to a few friends with special knowledge of particular movements who have given generous help.

In the matter of the spelling of oriental names, I have compromised by following for the most part the common usage, though here and there departing from it for the sake of fidelity to stricter standards. But many of these terms, like "Tai-ping," have passed into our stock of English words, and it savours a little of pedantry to interfere with them.

Some of these chapters in abbreviated form were given as lectures at Beloit College in Wisconsin, at the Theological Seminary in Hartford, Conn., at Union Theological Seminary, New York City, and on the Graves Foundation at the Theological Seminary in New Brunswick, New Jersey.

The study embodied in these volumes was undertaken (1) because the movements to be considered are among the greatest in history, and yet through the distortion of our historical perspective, some of them are wholly unknown to many of us, and others are unknown in their true proportions. We ought to be familiar with the great forces which have shaped the life and destiny of the 1,000,000,000 people who have been profoundly affected by these movements. (2) I hope to be able to indicate in this way the place of the missionary enterprise in the politics of the world. These movements were among the greatest developments of the last century, indeed, of all the centuries, and each of them is intelligible only as we understand its missionary relations. And (3) because whether we know little or much of ancient times, we ought to know about the present world of which we are a part. What is going on in it now is of greater interest than anything that has ever gone on in it before, barring the great series of events leading up to and embodied in the Christian revelation. I shall rejoice if these chapters enable any one to feel the fascination of watching the present developments of human history, in the light of their bearing on the religious life of man, and therefore on all his life and on the coming of the Kingdom of God.

R. E. S.

Contents

First Volume

I. THE TAI-PING REBELLION 11
II. THE INDIAN MUTINY 71
III. THE RELIGION OF THE BAB 119
IV. THE EMÁNCIPATION OF LATIN AMERICA . . 183
V. THE DEVELOPMENT OF AFRICA 227
VI. THE REFORM MOVEMENT IN HINDUISM . . 287

Second Volume

VII. THE TONG HAK INSURRECTION 357
VIII. THE TRANSFORMATION OF JAPAN 393
IX. THE ARMENIAN MASSACRES 439
X. THE GOING OF THE SPANIARD 487
XI. THE BOXER UPRISING 537
XII. THE COMING OF THE SLAV 595
XIII. MISSIONS AND THE WORLD MOVEMENT . . 657
INDEX 693

The Tai-ping Rebellion

I

THE TAI-PING REBELLION

THE middle of the last century was a time of great upheaval in three of the great countries of the world. There was movement and unrest everywhere,—a struggle for life in Mexico; revolutions and the birth of new nations in South America; Great Britain, France, Turkey and Russia locked in the wretched struggle of the Crimean War; Perry forcing the gates of Japan and inaugurating the conflict which was to issue in a new civilized state; and ferment and change over the whole face of Europe. Beside these movements stand the three of which I have spoken, the Civil War in America, the Sepoy Mutiny in India, and the Tai-ping Rebellion in China. Doubtless the contention could not be maintained that the issues of the Tai-ping Rebellion for the world at large have been as important as the issues of the Crimean War, or the opening of Japan; but in the number of people directly and fatally affected by it, the Tai-ping Uprising was the greatest movement of the century and one of the greatest movements of human history. Apart from the incalculable wealth that was annihilated,[1] and the misery and famine which followed it, it has been estimated that during its course twenty millions of human beings were destroyed. It began with the bright hope, as some believed, of opening the entire Empire to civilization and Christianity, and it ended by obliterating organized government in large parts of nine of the eighteen provinces of China, and filling them with anarchy and woe. "The Yellow River," says Archdeacon Moule, "may be regarded as a native type of the nation's history. That great waterway possesses vast capacities for blessing; its very name suggests the rich deposit which it leaves all down its tortuous course. But though destined to be a fertilizer and reviver of the land, it continually bursts its bounds and runs riot over the lower level of the surrounding country. . . . Similar has been the chequered course of the nation. With boundless capacities for joy . . . the Chinese nation has closed chapter after chapter of its long history in blood, in desolation and in woe."[1]

---

[1] "As regards the Yang-tse provinces there seems no reason why they should show a diminished revenue. The excuse still given is the Tai-ping Rebellion which no doubt did throw half the land out of cultivation and made the taxes temporarily irrecoverable over immense areas" (*British Foreign Office, 1897, Miscel. Series, No. 415, Report on Revenue and Expenditure of the Chinese Empire*, p. 17).

The condition of China in 1850 was singularly propitious for the outbreak and spread of insurrection. The Opium War[2] had been brought to a close in 1843, by the treaty of Nanking, which provided for lasting peace between China and Great Britain, opened five ports to trade and residence, ceded Hongkong to Great Britain, included the payment of $21,000,000 for the expense of the war, debts due British merchants and for the opium surrendered to the Chinese officials at Canton who were ordered to suppress the traffic, and specified that thereafter official correspondence should be conducted on terms of equality according to the standing of the parties. So far as the war was an Opium War, and it was so treated in Parliament and in British official utterances, the course of Great Britain was immoral and infamous, and the course of the central government of China patriotic and just. So far, however, as it was a war to abolish a certain spirit of intolerance and tyranny on the part of China, to bring her haughtiness and exclusiveness to an end, it was probably necessary, and would sooner or later have become just. But in any case, its effect was to leave the Chinese Government dumbfounded and shaken. It did not break Chinese pride or seclusion. On the other hand, the authorities drew back from foreign intercourse with increased dislike, and the imperial Government adopted the policy of making the governor general at Canton, the channel of correspondence with foreign ministers, and thus practically localized in the Canton province the worst consequences of Chinese defeat, and of the new relations between China and the West. There was some difficulty in opening trade at Foochow, due to the anti-foreign feeling of the gentry. At the three other northern ports trade began without difficulty. The situation in Canton and throughout the southern provinces was not favourable either to the assumption of new foreign relations by the Government, or to the maintenance of order at home. Race prejudices were strong, and there was a large number of unemployed soldiers who had flocked into Canton to enlist in the war. Disbanded now, some had remained in the city, others had scattered through the country. "Their lawlessness increased till it threatened the supremacy of the provincial government, and required the strongest measures of repression. The disorders spread rather than diminished under an impoverished treasury and ill paid soldiery." Canton province seethed with discontent, and discontent, too, felt and fomented by men who had been in war or enlisted for it and had become used to arms.[1] Much of this was due to dissatisfaction with the Government, both its failure and weakness against foreign nations, and its own internal rottenness.[2] The governor at Canton, Yeh, "like most Chinamen, had no idea of administration in its truest sense. His one remedy for all political offenses was the execution ground. Popular rights he ignored with even more than Chinese indifference, and thus aroused a spirit of antagonism among his subjects, which made itself felt in every part of the province."[3] A great many misfortunes, beside, had added to the unrest of the people. But the nature of Chinese society, its ideas of revolution,[1] the weakness and unpopularity of the central Government, and the great number of lawless characters were the vital elements in the situation which prepared the way for the rising of the Tai-pings. "The body of the Chinese people," says Williams, "are well aware that their rulers are no better than themselves in morals, honesty, or patriotism; but they are all ready to ascribe the evils they suffer from robbers, taxation, exactions and unjust sentences, to those in authority. The rulers are conscious that their countrymen consider it honourable to evade taxes, defy the police when they can safely do so, and oppose rather than aid in the maintenance of law and order. There is no basis of what in Christian lands is regarded as the foundation of social order and just government—the power of conscience and amenableness to law. . . . The most serious evils and sufferings in Chinese society are caused by its disorderly members not its rapacious rulers; and both can be removed and reformed only by the reception of a higher code which raises the standard of action from expediency to obligation."[2]

---

[1] Moule, *The Glorious Land*, p. 13.

[2] "Thomas Tyler Meadows attributes the success of the Tai-ping Rebellion largely to the disclosures of official weakness made by that first war. Certainly the official grip had been weakened, and it has never recovered itself" (*Chinese Recorder*, April, 1898, article by Dr. Ashmore, "The Missionary Movement in China." But vide Meadows' own account *The Chinese and Their Rebellions*, Chs. III, VII).

---

[1] Hake, *The Story of Chinese Gordon*, p. 39.

[2] "Government posts were sold; and to incompetent Manchus were added incompetent Chinese, whose constant and chief aim was to extort from the people the money they had spent in purchasing the power to do so. Hence spread of tyranny, which led at length to risings, which again had to be extinguished by an expenditure, that an increasing amount of inefficiency and corruption in the administration made ever greater and greater. Such was the downward course which continued to become more and more apparent during the reigns of Kea king and his son Taou kwang, up to the English war. This latter inflicted a dreadful blow on the Manchus; for their two provincial garrisons of Cha poo and Chin keang were defeated and almost destroyed, with an ease that shook their own confidence in the prowess and destiny of their race, and completely dispelled its prestige of military power in the eyes of the subject Chinese. And then the great costs of the struggle, of which the twenty-seven millions of dollars paid to the British at its close was but a small moiety, plunged the government into irremediable financial difficulties. The sale of government posts was carried on more extensively, and corruption, tyranny, disaffection, robbery, piracy, local insurrectionary risings, misgovernment in short, and no-government prevailed more than ever up to 1850, when the 'Kwang-si rebellion' broke out" (Meadows, *The Chinese and Their Rebellions*, p. 32f.).

[3] Douglass, *China*, p. 240f.

The conditions which prevailed in Kwang-tung and Kwang-si provinces, fostered the growth of the secret organizations which underlie Chinese society. Those who criticise the missionary movement because it creates a separate organization inside Chinese life, forget that that is not a new thing or an evil thing in the eyes of the Chinese people. "The natural tendency for persons of the same way of thinking," says a critic of missionaries, who yet knows much of the conditions in China, "especially when they have adopted a distinctive name, to form groups apart from the community in which they live, is largely developed among the Chinese secret societies, in fact constitutes one of the prominent features of Chinese life."[3] Foremost among the secret societies is the Sam Hop Wu, or Triad Society. It is a feared and hated organization, and since 1845 has been under the ban of the British Government at Hongkong, as it has always been loathed and suppressed by the Chinese Government as a league whose principles are "the repudiation of all jurisdiction and the assumption of this power by an irresponsible tribunal," whose members "engage to defend each other against the police, to hide each other's crimes,

[1] Meadows, *The Chinese and Their Rebellions*, Chs. II, X.
[2] Williams, *History of China*, p. 229.
[3] Michie, *Missionaries in China*, p. 49.

and to assist detected members in making their escape from justice."[1] The origin of the Triad Society is lost in the mists of the past. Its cradle was in the provinces of Kwang-tung and Fu-kien, which were the most energetic opponents of the Tartar dynasty. At this time, 1850, the society had "degenerated into a band of rebels and robbers, that seemed to have lost every notion of the proper spirit of its association." Yet even now it seized the opportunity to revive its battle cry for the old dynasty as against usurpers. The first sentence of its oath of membership read, "We combine everywhere to recall the Ming and exterminate the Barbarians, cut off the Tsing and await the right prince."[2] The Triad Society undoubtedly was active in these days of turbulence in the provinces of Kwang-tung and Kwang-si, and the atmosphere was fitted to encourage any movement which could command the devotion of some sincere men, offer a common object and plan of movement, and by its success supply a rallying place for the disaffected elements which in China are always ready to rise and follow a leader.

Some difference of opinion prevails as to the relation of the Triad Society to the Tai-ping movement. Some deny any such relation.[3] Others make no mention of it. Others express doubt, while recognizing the place Triad leaders had in the early stages of the movement, thinking themselves "the true originators of the rebellion."[4] But Dyer Ball asserts that Hung Siu-tsuen, the extraordinary man to whom the rebellion is due and with whom it died, was a member of the society, and that it was among its lodges that he found the first acceptance of the strange doctrines which he had made up from Christianity, grafted on the old stock of Triad opinions and purposes. Whatever the relations of Hung to the Triad Society at the outset, there was an early rupture.[5] The Triad chiefs were afraid of the strict discipline of the Tai-ping camp and withdrew. Hung Siu-tsuen then declared his settled hostility to the order and proclaimed that any who would follow him must leave it.[1] At any rate the social situation that was ripe for the work of the Triad Society was ripe for

---

[1] Ball, *Things Chinese*, p. 361f.

[2] Boulger, *A Short History of China*, p. 237.

[3] Holcomb, *The Real Chinese Question*, p. 113.

[4] Boulger, *A Short History of China*, pp. 237, 239.

[5] While encamped at the village of Tae tsun in 1851 "eight rebel chiefs belonging to the Triad Society, intimated to Hung Siu-tsuen their wish to join his army with their respective bands. Hung Siu-tsuen granted their request, but under condition that they would conform to the worship of the true God. The eight chiefs declared themselves willing to do so, and sent their tribute of oxen, pigs, rice, etc. Hung Siu-tsuen now dispatched sixteen of the brethren belonging to the congregation, two to each chief, in order to impart to them and their followers some knowledge of the true religion before they had taken the definite step of

joining him. When preparatory instruction had been received, the chiefs dismissed their tutors with a liberal sum of money, as a reward for their trouble, and soon after, they, with all their followers, joined the army of Hung Siu-tsuen. Fifteen of the teachers who had been sent out to the chiefs, now in accordance with the laws of the congregation gave the money which they had received into the common treasury; but one of them kept the money for himself, without saying a word. This same individual had several times before, by his misconduct, made himself amenable to punishment, and had been spared only in consideration of his eloquence in preaching. He had, in the first instance, not fully abstained from the use of opium, but to procure the drug had sold some rattan-bucklers belonging to the army; another time being excited with wine, he had injured some of the brethren. As soon as his concealment of the money was proved, Hung Siu-tsuen and the man's own relatives, who were present in the army, desired to have him punished according to the full rigor of the law, and ordered him to be decapitated as a warning to all. When the chiefs of the Triad Society saw that one of those who had just before been dispatched as a teacher to them, was now killed for a comparatively small offense, they felt very uncomfortable, and said,—

"'Your laws seem to be rather too strict; we shall perhaps find it difficult to keep them, and upon any small transgression you would perhaps kill us also.'

"Thereupon" seven chiefs "with their men, departed and afterwards surrendered to the Imperialists, turning their arms against the insurgents. Lo ta kang alone remained with Hung Siu-tsuen, because he liked the discipline of his army, and the doctrine which they had adopted as a rule of their conduct. It is said that six of the above chiefs of the Triad Society ultimately fell into the hands of the insurgents while fighting against them, and were killed. Hung Siu-tsuen had formerly expressed his opinion of the Triad Society in about the following language:—

"'Though I never entered the Triad Society I have often heard it said that their object is to subvert the Tsing and restore the Ming dynasty. Such an expression was very proper in the time of Kang he when this society was at first formed, but now, after the lapse of two hundred years, we may still speak of subverting the Tsing, but we cannot properly speak of restoring the Ming. At all events when our native mountains and rivers are recovered a new dynasty must be established. How could we at present arouse the energies of men by speaking of restoring the Ming dynasty? There are several evil practices connected with the Triad Society, which I detest. If any new member enter the society, he must worship the devil and utter thirty-six oaths; a sword is placed upon his neck, and he is forced to contribute money for the use of the society. Their real object has now become very mean and unworthy. If we preach the true doctrine, and rely upon the powerful help of God, a few of us will equal a multitude of others. I do not even think that Sun pin, Woo ke, Kung-ming and others famous in history for their military skill and tactics, are deserving much estimation—how much less these bands of the Triad Society?'

"Hung Siu-tsuen afterwards ordered his followers not to receive among their number any Triad men but such as were willing to abandon their former practices and to receive instruction in the true doctrine" (Meadows, *The Chinese and Their Rebellions*, pp. 151–153).

[1] Williams, *History of China*, p. 239.

such a movement as the Tai-ping Rebellion, and the mysterious methods of Hung Siu-tsuen were sure to appeal to many to whom the paraphernalia of a secret order are attractive, while sincere men, truly desiring some reform, would be drawn to a movement with so much about it tending to righteousness as characterized the Tai-pings in their first and best days.

Hung Siu-tsuen, the founder of the movement, was a Hakka boy, born in 1813 in a village on the North River about thirty miles from Canton. The Hakkas are immigrants and suffer from serious disabilities; among them a certain serious prejudice against their preferment in the civil service examinations. The northern section of the Kwang-tung or Canton province is covered with fortifications used by and against the Hakkas in the civil wars in which they have been engaged with the Pun-tis or indigenous tribes. As late as 1864, 150,000 Hakkas were killed in one of the wars in the southwest corner of the province. A Hakka boy was sure to grow up with feelings of distrust or hatred against the dominant section of the population. This particular boy, though poor, was ambitious, and by sacrifice and study was able to prepare for the civil service examination, and while there met a native evangelist, Liang A-fah, a disciple of Milne and Morrison, who was distributing some Christian tracts which he had composed, and some portions of the Scriptures. The venerable appearance of the evangelist attracted the young student, and he accepted a set of tracts entitled "Good Words to Exhort the Age." Upon reaching home and discovering that these tracts advocated Christianity, then a proscribed doctrine, he laid them aside. Four years later he went to Canton to the examinations again. Failing once more to obtain what he desired, he returned home, quite ill, and went to bed expecting to die. After speaking to his parents "he shut his eyes and lost all strength and command over his body and became unconscious of what was going on around him. His outward senses were inactive, his body appeared as dead, but his soul was acted upon by a peculiar energy, seeing and remembering things of a very extraordinary nature.

"At first when his eyes were closed, he saw a dragon, a tiger and a cock enter the room; a great number of men playing upon instruments then approached, bearing a beautiful sedan chair in which they bade him to be seated. Not knowing what to make of this honour, he was carried away to a luminous and beautiful place wherein a multitude of fine men and women saluted him on arrival with expressions of joy. On leaving the sedan an old woman took him down to a river, saying: 'Thou dirty man, why hast thou kept company with yonder people and defiled thyself? I must now wash thee clean.' After the washing was over he entered a large building in company with a crowd of old and virtuous men, some of whom were the ancient sages. Here they opened his body, took out the heart and other organs, and replaced them by new ones of a red colour; this done, the wound closed without a scar. The whole assembly then went on to another larger hall, whose splendour was beyond description, in which an aged man, with a golden beard and dressed in black robes, sat on the highest place. Seeing Siu-tsuen, he began to shed tears, and said: 'All human beings in the world are produced and sustained by me; they eat my food and wear my clothing, but not one among them has a heart to remember and venerate me; what is worse, they take my gifts and therewith worship demons; they purposely rebel against me and arouse my anger. Do thou not imitate them.' Hereupon he gave him a sword to destroy the demons, a seal to overcome the spirits, and a sweet yellow fruit to eat. Siu-tsuen received them, and straightway began to exhort his venerable companions to perform their duties to their master. After doing so even to tears, the high personage led him to a spot whence he could behold the world below, and discern the horrible depravity and vice of its inhabitants. The sight was too awful to be endured, and words were inadequate to describe it. So he awoke from his trance, and had vigour enough to rise and dress himself and go to his father. Making a bow, Siu-tsuen said: 'The venerable old man above has commanded that all men shall turn to me, and that all treasures shall flow to me.' This sickness continued about forty days, and the visions were multiplied. He often met with a man in them whom he called his elder brother, who instructed him how to act and assisted him in going after and killing evil spirits. He became more and more possessed with the idea, as his health returned, that he had been commissioned to be Emperor of China; and one day his father found a slip on which was written, 'The Heavenly King of Great Reason, the Sovereign King Tsuen.' As time wore on, this lofty idea seems to have more and more developed his mind to a soberness and purity which overawed and attracted him. Nothing is said about his utterances while the war with England was progressing, but he must have known its progress and results. His cataleptic fits and visions seem not to have returned, and he pursued his avocation as a school-teacher until about 1843, having meanwhile failed in another trial to obtain a degree at Canton. In that year his wife's brother asked to take away the nine tracts of Liang A-fah to see what they contained; when he returned them to Siu-tsuen he urged him to read them too."[1]

The war with England was over and there was a natural interest to know what the opinions of the Western people were. It was this curiosity doubtless which led Hung's friend Li to ask for the books. Hung himself now read them, and as he read he saw the meaning of his visions. The venerable old man who sat upon the highest place was God the Father. His guide was Jesus Christ, and the demons were the idols. "These books," he said, "are certainly sent purposely of heaven to me to confirm the truth of my former experience. If I had received them without having gone through the sickness, I should not have dared to believe in them, and by myself to oppose the customs of the world. If I had merely been sick, but not also received the books, I should have had no further evidence as to the truth of my visions, which might also have been considered as mere products of a diseased imagination."[2] History is full of interesting relationships. The same war which fastened the opium curse on China, opened the country to the missionary, and it led Hung Siu-tsuen to take up the Christian tracts and confirmed his visions, and thus set on foot the vast movement which might never have been born if Liang A-fah's tracts had lain undisturbed where Siu-tsuen put them six years before.

But the tracts had come to light, and Hung and his friend Li studied them together, and thought deeply on the great subjects which had come to control their minds. Siu-tsuen became thoroughly convinced that "he had held real communications with the God of Heaven, and had been intrusted by Him with a special message."[3] He at once began to proclaim his mission and to exhort men to accept Christianity. What he called Christianity, however, was the system which he and Li had developed, and which contained "a modicum of Christian truth, together with many singular new conceptions and vagaries of their imaginations."[1] The tracts which they possessed dealt with not a few of the facts of Christianity, and there was a full relation of the life and death of Christ. There were soon several converts. These put away their idols and the Confucian tablet, and baptized themselves in a brook "as a sign of their purification and faith in Jesus."

---

[1] Williams, *History of China*, p. 232f.

[2] *Ibid*, p. 233f.

[3] Nevius, *China and the Chinese*, p. 419.

"The strange notions, unaffected earnestness, moral conduct, and new ideas about God and happiness of these men soon began to attract people to them, some to dispute and cavil, others to accept and worship with them. Their scholars, one and all, deserted them as soon as the Confucian tablet was removed from the schoolroom, and they were left penniless and unemployed, sometimes subjected to beatings and obloquy for embracing an outlandish religion, and other times ridiculed for forsaking the ancestral halls."[2] Accordingly, Hung Siu-tsuen and Fung Yun-san, a teacher of the neighborhood, who with the family of Hung and some other literary men, were the first converts, started out from home to preach elsewhere, hoping to support themselves by selling writing pencils and ink. After visiting numerous places in the province of Kwang-si, and preaching everywhere the living God and what they believed of salvation through His Son, they came to Kwei hsien and made a number of converts there. Thence Fung Yun-san went out alone, met some workmen whom he knew, took up employment with them in carrying earth, and soon formed in the neighbourhood a number of congregations which became known as the "Society of God Worshippers," or *Shang-ti Hui*. As the worship of Shang-ti, the Supreme Ruler, the "title," says Dr. Martin, "to which the Chinese had always attached their highest ideas of the Supreme Being,"[3] is a peculiar function of the Emperor, the new sect came naturally to be regarded as treasonable, as well as sacrilegious and impious, because of its treatment of the idols and Confucian tablets. At this time, however, it was a purely religious movement, ill-informed, raw and in great need of guidance, but sincere and hopeful.

---

[1] "A favorite conceit, among others, was to assume that wherever the character *ch'üan*, meaning 'whole,' 'altogether,' occurred in a verse, it meant himself, and as it forms a part of the Chinese phrase for almighty, he thus had strong reasons (as he thought) for his course. The phrase Tien-kwoh, denoting the 'Kingdom of Heaven' in Christ's preaching, they applied to China" (Williams, *History of China*, p. 234).

[2] Williams, *History of China*, p. 234f.

[3] *Cycle of Cathay*, p. 134.

Hung Siu-tsuen must have known of the missionaries in Canton, and feeling need of a larger knowledge of Christianity, he went to Canton in 1847 to visit the Rev. I. J. Roberts, an American Baptist missionary. He then applied for baptism, but Mr. Roberts hesitated to accede, and Hung Siu-tsuen soon left without having connected himself with any of the mission churches. Little did any one foresee as he went quietly away the immense upheaval which that poor and obscure school-teacher was about to cause, shaking the Chinese Empire from boundary to boundary.[1]

---

[1] Of this visit Mr. Meadows writes more fully on the basis of the information given to Mr. Hamberg, a missionary at Hongkong, by Hung Jin whose narrative Mr. Hamberg published. "About the end of 1846 he learned from a person connected with the establishment of Mr. Roberts, an American missionary at Canton, that the latter was preaching there. That foreign missionaries were preaching in Canton must however been known to him before. It is a fact of considerable significance, that he had not previously, nor did he now, attempt to put himself into communication with them. In April, 1847, however, an event took place that drew the attention of the whole department and even the whole province on foreigners. The British Plenipotentiary, Sir John Davis, suddenly left Hongkong with a small naval and military force, entered the river, took all the forts which guard it, and, after spiking 827 pieces of artillery, established himself in military occupation of the foreign settlement at the provincial capital. One of his objects was to insist on the immediate possession of land as a site for warehouses to which we were entitled by treaty, but which we had never received. An erroneous notion of the nature of this demand getting abroad, the rural population not only in the immediate neighbourhood of Canton, but up to the borders of Hung Siu-tsuen's district, formed themselves into bands of volunteers to resist what they held to be a step in the prosecution of a design to seize their country. This drew general attention as well to the plans of foreigners, as to the apparent inability of the Manchu Government to resist people entertaining such plans. *Within a month or six weeks afterwards we find Hung Siu-tsuen studying the foreign Scriptures at Mr. Roberts' establishment*; and it would appear that from this period the idea occasionally crossed his mind in a vague way that the patriotic day-dreams of his youth might possibly have a chance of realization. But he must have been silly to a degree altogether disproved by his subsequent proceedings and career, had he then allowed himself to indulge in a distinct intention of trying to overturn the existing government. So far from this being the case, we find that he, after a two months' study with Mr. Roberts, appears to have inclined to the belief that it was as a preacher under the direction of foreigners that he was to prosecute his 'mission' of religious reformer. He applied for baptism, and prompted by the insidious advice of a countryman on the establishment who feared him as a rival, also for a monthly support. The latter request naturally drew a refusal of the former from Mr. Roberts; who had observed nothing in the applicant to distinguish him from other men of the class. Hung Siu-tsuen then left for Kwang-si, and it is worthy of note, as exemplifying the manner in which circumstances affecting individuals may influence religious

Although thus far the movement had been religious, Hung Jin, one of the first converts, says that Hung Siu-tsuen had already expressed sentiments disloyal to the Manchu dynasty; but that was a part of Triad doctrine, and too common among the Cantonese to attract notice. When, however, Hung Siu-tsuen, after returning home, visited Fung Yun-san, and saw the two thousand converts who had been gathered there into the "Society of Worshippers of God," it would have been strange if he did not begin to see the possibility of the fulfillment of his dreams, that he himself would some day be Emperor of China. He at once took hold of the new community, and was recognized as leader and guide. He introduced a severe discipline, prohibited the use of opium and spirits, instituted the observance of the Sabbath, and regulated the worship of God. Other reforms were soon introduced. The queue was cut off, the hair was allowed to grow long, and from this the followers of Hung Siu-tsuen got their name, Chang-mao tseh or "Long-haired rebels," as they were called at Peking, and by all loyal to the Government. A new style of dress was sooner or later adopted also, reverting to the fashion which prevailed in the time of the Mings, when the robe was worn open in front. By 1850 the Association had grown to quite a body, and Hung Siu-tsuen had thoroughly imbued it with his views, gathered around him his own relatives, and selected his lieutenants.

institutions, that in the religious publications of the rebels obtained from them at Nanking six years after this, new converts are taught *how to baptize themselves.*"

What Mr. Roberts recalled of this visit was published in *The Chinese and General Missionary Gleaner*, February, 1853: "Some time in 1846, or the year following, two Chinese gentlemen came to my house in Canton professing a desire to be taught the Christian religion. One of them soon returned home, but the other continued with us two months or more, during which time he studied the Scriptures and received instruction, and maintained a blameless deportment. That one seems to be this Hung Siu-tsuen, the chief; and the narrator was, perhaps, the gentleman who came with him, but soon returned home. When the chief first came to us he presented a paper written by himself, giving a minute account of having received the book of which his friend speaks in his narrative; of his being taken sick, during which he professed to see a vision, and gave the details of what he saw, which he said confirmed him in the belief of what he read in the book. And he told some things in the account of his vision which I confess I was then at a loss, and still am, to know whence he got them without a more extensive knowledge of the Scriptures. He requested to be baptized, but left for Kwang-si before we were fully satisfied of his fitness; but what had become of him I knew not until now. *Description of the man:* He is a man of ordinary appearance, about five feet four or five inches high; well built, round faced, regular featured, rather handsome, about middle age, and gentlemanly in his manners" (Meadows, *The Chinese and their Rebellions*, pp. 86–88, 192).

Already the movement began to display two characteristics which were to receive great development, the one to diminish the value of the movement as a religious influence, and the other to make it the vast military power it became. The first was the innovation on the part of Hung Siu-tsuen of promulgating his decrees as revelations either from the Heavenly Father or the Elder Brother, who were reported to have come down into the world to give him directions as to his course. This was the beginning of the wild fanatical self-deception and imposture which gradually obscured the early direct religious character of the Association. The second was the introduction of the use of force. This same year Hung Siu-tsuen's followers destroyed temples in their zeal against idolatry, and resisted some soldiers sent to arrest the leaders. The movement took on also a good deal of the nature of the standing quarrel between the Pun-tis and the Hakkas, most of the Tai-ping leaders being Hakkas. Whenever Hakka villages were worsted by the Pun-tis, those who had lost would join the Association at its headquarters. Soon the numbers had grown so that a large market town was taken and fortified, and the great companies of recruits who came were drilled and taught and absorbed into the force, being required to conform to its religious practices and tenets. It was here that the imperialist troops made an attack upon the Tai-pings which failed, the latter marching off to find more room for the growing company.

The course of the imperialists added to its growth. Their cruelty and the way the Government closed all doors against the acknowledgment of the loyalty of the Association or its sympathizers, drove a great many doubting people into its ranks, while its success and its hostility, now forced upon it, to the established order, drew to its standards all the disaffected and disorderly elements of society, who had anything to gain and nothing to lose by a movement that erased existing obligations and dissolved the bonds of society. The Association at once absorbed these elements, however, and its camps were models of discipline and good order. The women and children were placed in a separate encampment and women were appointed as officers over the women's camp.[1]

---

[1] The conditions at first were remarkably sagacious and well ordered. Meadows wrote in 1853 of the Tai-ping government:

"From high to low they eat in parties of eight, each party having one table. Before seating themselves to eat all kneel, and the chief person at the table de-

For two years Hung Siu-tsuen met with practically uninterrupted success. The army grew in size and equipment and efficiency, and entrenched at Yung-ngan was prepared by its leaders for its future work, which was made clear to it by the very opposition of the Government and its denunciation of the Association as treasonable. There was no course but one. To go back meant punishment and death. To go on meant, if Hung Siu-tsuen correctly interpreted the leadings of what he believed to be Providence, the subjugation of the Empire. These were the best days of the Association. It was still comparatively pure, and it retained the simple notions with which

voutly repeats a considerable portion of this book. All the fugitives from Nanking, Chin kiang, and Yang chow agreed as to this circumstance of reverent recitation by the whole army before meals. . . . Another striking fact, equally well authenticated as that of the recitation before meals, is that rape and adultery in the cities taken by storm are inexorably punished by death. The different fugitives conversed with, though anything but friendly to the insurgents, when questioned on this point all scouted, in the way one scouts some *outrageous* calumny of one's unfriends, the idea of rape being permitted by them. On the contrary, all spoke in terms of wonder, if not of respect, of their chastity. The Chinese women found in Nanking and Chin kiang are all, young and old, shut up in separate buildings, and divided into squads of twenty-five, of whom the senior is constituted overseer, and according to which regular rations are served out to them. They are employed in preparing ammunition. No male, not even as father or husband, is allowed to enter the buildings thus appropriated. Whoever does so is put to death without further question. But the women were told by the leaders that their separation from their husbands and male relatives was only a temporary measure, and that as soon as affairs were settled all would be reunited. Great care is taken of all children that come into their possession. The ragged are at once well clothed; and the boys are barracked under special officials, by whom they are carefully instructed in the knowledge of the Sacred Book and in the use of arms. I have now only to add that all informants declare opium-smoking to be punished by decapitation, and even tobacco-smoking by bambooing; and Your Excellency will perceive that there are in the scanty, but tolerably well authenticated particulars ascertained, striking indications of this movement being puritanic and religious, if not fanatical, as well as patriotic and political. I should expect to find the new faith a spiritualized monotheistic Confucianism, *i. e.*, the hitherto existing excellent system of national ethics with the addition of the two things wanting, a God and an immortal life; these latter borrowed in reality from Christian missionary translations and writings, but now taught from the new Koran of a Chinese prophet. I may add that all the idols at Nanking, Chin kiang and Yang chow have been destroyed, and all priests killed who have not made submission and allowed the hair of their heads to grow, *i. e.*, abjured. But at the same time that I see indications of a strong religious feeling or even of fanaticism, a careful consideration of all the various acts attributed to the insurgents leads to the conclusion that their laws and rules are the work of sagacious and well-regulated minds; such laws and rules all tending to the gradual but sure extension of their numbers from a daily increasing nucleus of tried and devoted adherents, whether originally volunteers or pressed men." But the conditions soon deteriorated (Meadows, *The Chinese and Their Rebellions*, pp. 242–244).

Hung Siu-tsuen began. Religious worship was maintained in the camp. Saturday was observed as Sabbath. "The Scriptures were read and expounded according to their understanding of them; prayers were offered; hymns and doxologies sung in honour of the Triune God; and eloquent preachers exhorted the multitude, urging them to honour and obey God, to be faithful to His vicegerent, the new Emperor, and to fight bravely for the establishment of the 'heavenly dynasty,' promising positions of honour and influence in the new state, as well as eternal blessedness in heaven."[1] It was from the dynastic title the rebels chose that the name Tai-ping is derived, Ping Chao or Peace Dynasty as contrasted with the Tsing Chao, or Pure Dynasty, as the Manchus called theirs. To these words the adjective "great" was prefixed, which in Cantonese is Tai; so that the rebels became known to foreigners as the Tai-pings.

It is desirable to appreciate fully this truly religious character of the rebellion at the outset.

From personal contact with the Tai-pings, shortly after they had taken Nanking, Mr. Meadows who was in the British Government service formed a high estimate of their moral and religious character:

> "Their moral code, the Rebels call the 'Heavenly Rules'; which on examination proved to be the Ten Commandments. The observance of these is strictly enforced by the leaders of the movement, chiefly Kwang-tung and Kwang-si men, who are not merely formal professors of a religious system, but practical and spiritual Christians, deeply influenced by the belief that God is always with them. The hardships they have suffered, and the dangers they have incurred, are punishments and trials of their Heavenly Father; the successes they have achieved, are instances of His Grace. In conversation they 'bore' the more worldly minded by constant recurrence to that special attention of the Almighty of which they believe themselves to be the objects. With proud humility and with the glistening eyes of gratitude, they point back to the fact that at the beginning of their enterprise some four years ago, they numbered but one or two hundred, and that, except for the direct help of their Heavenly Father, they never could have done what they have done.
>
> "'They,' said one, speaking of the Imperialists, 'spread all kinds of lies about us. They say we employ magical arts: the only kind of magic we have used is prayer to God. In Kwang-si, when we occupied Yung-ngan, we were sorely pressed: there was then only some two or three thousand of us. We were beset on all sides by much greater numbers; we had no powder left and our provisions were all done. But our Heavenly Father came down and showed us the way to

---

[1] Nevius, *China and the Chinese*, p. 422.

break out. So we put our wives and children in the middle, and not only forced a passage but completely beat our enemies.' After a short pause he added—'If it be the will of God that our Tai-ping Prince shall be the Sovereign of China he will be the Sovereign of China. If not, we will die here.'

"The man who used this language of courageous fidelity to the cause in every extreme, and of confidence in God, was a shrivelled up, elderly, little individual, who made an odd figure in his yellow and red hood. But he could think the thoughts and speak the speech of a hero. He and others like him have succeeded in infusing their own sentiments of courage and morality to no slight extent, considering the materials operated upon, into the minds of their adherents"[1]

Other judgments of Mr. Meadows, writing in 1853, regarding the high religious character of the insurrection in its earlier stage should be added.

"If I were required to give an idea of Tai-ping Christianity by a reference to some known European sect, I should describe it as a Chinese Swedenborgian Christianity. Both Tai-pingism and Swedenborgianism acknowledged the authority of the Christian Scriptures, both understand them differently from other Christians, and both add a new dispensation. The Swedenborgians, who now number twelve thousand in Great Britain, deny the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice, of justification by faith alone, and of the resurrection of the material body. They hold that salvation is not obtainable without repentance and living a life of charity and faith according to the Commandments; and that man after death rises in a spiritual body in which he lives to eternity, either in heaven or hell according to his past life. In all this there is much similarity with the doctrines of the Tai-pings. But while Swedenborgianism is Protestant Christianity modified by an extensive knowledge of physical science; Tai-pingism is Protestant Christianity modified by Confucian philosophy. The political circumstances of Tai-pingism, and its connection with war, cause of course still further differences; and make it, in truth, impossible to give a correct idea of it by any analogy" . . .[2]

"The Book of Heavenly Rules describes the mode of formal acceptance of the new faith. All men, it says, have violated the Heavenly Rules, and hitherto the manner of deliverance from the consequences has been unknown. But 'hereafter whoever makes repentance of his guilt before Hwang shang ti, and abstains from idolatry, depravity and breach of the Heavenly Rules, will be permitted to ascend into Heaven and enjoy happiness to all eternity.' Those who do not, will be cast into hell and suffer misery to all eternity. Those who repent should 'kneel before Heaven and pray Hwang shang ti to forgive their guilt; in doing which, they may if they please use a written form.' They are then to 'wash the body with water from a basin or, what is still better, to bathe in a river,' *i. e.*, they are *to baptize themselves.* From that time forth, they are 'to worship Hwang shang ti, morning and evening; to beseech Him for protection, and for the gift of His Spirit to reform their hearts; to thank Him before meals; on the seventh day, the day of worship, to praise Him for His goodness; at all times to obey the ten Heavenly Rules; and on no account to worship any of the false gods of the world, nor to practice any of the depravities of the world. Thus they will become sons and daughters of Hwang shang ti; in life they will enjoy His protection; after death their souls will ascend to Heaven, and there enjoy happiness forever. Let all the people in the world, whether Chinese or foreigners, men or women, but do this, and they will be enabled to ascend into heaven.'

---

[1] Meadows, *The Chinese and Their Rebellions*, p. 281f.

[2] *Ibid*, p. 439.

"These then are, in the words of its founders, the *essentials* of the Tai-ping Christianity" . . .[1]

"The morality adopted by the Tai-ping religion has hitherto been strict, and is not likely to degenerate: Confucianism and Christianity combine to prevent that. Further, by a few sentences in the introduction to the Tai-ping calendar, it sweeps away the whole system of divination, fortune-telling, and 'lucky days,' which many of us have cause to know is a practical trammel on the otherwise free action, as to days and times, of the un-Christianized Chinese. But its views of the supernatural world are manifestly degenerating in the hands of the fanatical party. In their conception of the Deity they seem to be exaggerating more and more the originally anthropomorphic leaning of Hung Siu-tsuen, and to be transforming the spiritual and catholic paternity, ascribed to God in the Book of Declarations, into a corporeal and limited fatherhood. Without having as yet *published* anything to that effect, they, in their official communications with foreigners, show at least a tendency to ascribe to God the Father a human body, with human feelings and occupations; to regard Him as wearing man's clothing; to look on the Virgin Mary as His wife in heaven; to establish an identity between her and the Heavenly Mother of the Chinese Pantheon; and to consider her the mother, not of Jesus only, but of several other sons. In like manner, they appear inclined to give to Jesus a wife from among the goddesses of the uncultivated Chinese; and consider Him as having a family of sons and daughters, the grandchildren of God the Father. It is in fact plain, that the Eastern Prince and his followers are the representatives of a Buddhistic or Taoistic element, that is struggling with the Confucian element to assert for itself a place in the new religion."[2]

This Buddhist element unfortunately grew increasingly powerful.

Something should be added about the character of the Tai-ping literature. Their recognition of the Trinity is shown in the following doxology prepared for use on the Lord's Day:

"We praise God our holy and heavenly Father.
We praise Jesus, the holy Lord and Saviour of the world.
We praise the Holy Spirit the Sacred Intelligence.
We praise the Three Persons who united constitute one true spirit (God)."

---

[1] *Ibid*, p. 426f.

[2] *Ibid*, p. 440f.

This quotation from their Trimetrical Classic will indicate their knowledge of the main facts of Christ's life and their belief in them :

> "But the great God
> Out of pity to mankind,
> Sent His first-born Son
> To come down into the world.
> His name is Jesus,
> The Lord and Saviour of men,
> Who redeemed them from sin
> By the endurance of extreme misery.
> Upon the Cross
> They nailed His body
> Where He shed His precious blood
> To save all mankind.
> Three days after His death
> He rose from the dead,
> And during forty days,
> They discoursed on heavenly things.
> When He was about to descend
> He commanded His disciples
> To communicate His gospel,
> And proclaim His revealed will.
> Those who believe will be saved,
> And ascend up to heaven.
> But those who do not believe
> Will be the first to be condemned."

As against idols this is the declaration of the *Imperial Declaration :*

> "It is your duty every morning to adore, and every evening to worship Him.
> Reason demands that you should praise Him for His goodness, and sing of His doings.
>
> * * * * * * * *
>
> He created the elements of nature and all material things.
> No other spiritual being interferes with His arrangements.
> Let us then depend on God alone for assistance,
> And never ascribe to idols the honour of creation.
> If any should say that creation depends on idols
> We would just inquire how things went on before they were set up.
> He warms us by His sun ; He moistens us by His rain ;
> He moves the thunderbolt ; He scatters the wind :
> All these are the wondrous operations of God alone.
> Those who acknowledge heaven's favour will obtain a glorious reward."

And that all this was not intended to be mere general worship is indicated by more than one personal passage in the Tai-ping books. Some have said that the Tai-pings showed no knowledge of man's depravity and the need of personal repentance and faith. But such prayers as the following "Prayer for a Penitent Sinner" from the *Book of Religious Precepts* supports quite a different view :

> "I Thine unworthy son or daughter, kneeling down upon the ground, with a true heart repent of my sins and pray Thee, the great God our heavenly Father, of Thine infinite goodness and mercy to forgive my former ignorance and frequent transgressions of the divine commands; earnestly beseech Thee of Thy great favour, to pardon all my former sins, and enable me to repent, and lead a new life, so that my soul may ascend to heaven: may I from henceforth sincerely repent and forsake my evil ways, not worshipping corrupt spirits (gods) nor practicing perverse things, but obey the divine commands. I also earnestly pray Thee, the great God our heavenly Father, constantly to bestow on me Thy Holy Spirit and change my wicked heart; never more allow me to be deceived by malignant demons, but, perpetually regarding me with favour, forever deliver me from the evil one; and every day bestowing upon me food and clothing, exempt me from calamity and woe, granting me tranquillity in the present world and the enjoyment of endless happiness in heaven; through the merits of our Saviour and heavenly Brother, the Lord Jesus, who redeemed us from sin. I also pray the great God, our Father who is in Heaven, that His will may be done on earth as it is done in heaven. That Thou wouldst look down and grant this my request is my heart's sincere desire."

These utterances do not all belong to the period spent at Yungngan, and as has been intimated, quite a different note had already been struck by the leader which was destined to be given disastrous development. This claim to personal and immediate communication with God, a dangerous doctrine in any man's hands, whether Mohammed or Hung Siu-tsuen or Joseph Smith, became increasingly prominent. Thus in one book of verse it is said :

> "He (the Chief) was received up into heaven,
> Where the great God personally instructed him,
> Gave him orders and documents
> With a seal and sword,
> And majesty irresistible.
> The celestial Mother was kind and exceedingly gracious;
> The celestial Elder Brother's wife was virtuous and prudent."

And in the *Celestial Decrees* issued in March, 1853, just before the capture of Nanking, and containing a series of revelations, it is said :

> "The Heavenly Father addressed the multitude, saying, 'O My children! Do you know your Heavenly Father, and your Celestial Elder Brother?' To which they all replied, 'We know our Heavenly Father and Celestial Elder Brother.' The Heavenly Father then said, 'Do you know your Lord and truly?' To which they replied, 'We know our Lord right well.' The Heavenly Father then said, 'I have sent your Lord down into the world to become the Celestial King (Tien Wang); every word he utters is a celestial command; you must truly assist your Lord and regard your King; you must not dare to act disorderly nor to be disrespectful. If you do not regard your Lord and King, every one of you will be involved in difficulty.'"

It was by such names that Hung Siu-tsuen came to be called, his own name being regarded as too sacred for use. The banners borne by the army carried instead such names as Heavenly Father, Heavenly Elder Brother, Heavenly King; the last being Hung Siu-tsuen's description.

This decree which has just been quoted was issued in 1851, and shortly after, in 1852, deeming that the time had come, the host started north into Hu-nan, passed down the Siang river to the Yang-tse, and thence down the Yang-tse valley in a course of almost uninterrupted conquest to the walls of the ancient capital at Nanking. After a siege they took the city and put its Tartar garrison to death. It is true that the sacrifice was one of great cruelty, but in the first place the Tai-pings believed that they were called to exterminate the Tartars, and in the second place, they had ample precedent for their cruelty in Chinese history and in the records of the Manchu dynasty, which had been itself established in blood. And while the path of the Tai-ping armies to the gates of Nanking was tracked by ruin and suffering, it was due almost as much to the imperialist troops as to the Tai-pings, who treated with leniency cities and towns which surrendered to them, and who believed that in annihilating others they were but visiting judgment upon those who had resisted the will of heaven.[1]

---

[1] "When continued success had established in the minds of the Tai-pings the conviction of the reality of the Heavenly Prince, Hung Siu-tsuen, they took up this definite attitude towards the Chinese people, as well as the Manchus: 'Our Heavenly Prince has received the Divine Commission to exterminate the Manchus—to exterminate them utterly, men, women and children—to exterminate

The triumphant course of the Tai-pings was due to a variety of causes. First of all they were animated by an intense religious spirit, and believed they were led by heavenly inspired guides, and they had the fierce and irresistible courage which these convictions produce. Beyond this, they were under remarkable order for Chinese troops, and their successes had equipped them with food and clothes, so that to join them meant security and prosperity. Again, they were knit together by bonds within and pressure from without. It is said that the words Tai-ping, in Chinese characters, were branded upon the cheeks of some, so that they could not desert without inviting death from those into whose hands they might fall. From without, the imperialist troops showed by their savagery that a Tai-ping caught by them was in worse plight than any could be in the Tai-ping camps. Beside all this "a national dislike of the Manchus on the part of the Chinese lay at the bottom of all this coldness (of the people towards the Government's efforts to suppress the rebellion). They felt, too,

---

all idolaters generally, and to possess the Empire as its True Sovereign. It and everything in it is his, its mountains and rivers, its broad lands and public treasuries; you, and all that you have, your family, males and females from yourself to your youngest child, and your property from your patrimonial estates to the bracelet on your infant's arm. We command the services of all, and we take everything. All who resist us are rebels and idolatrous demons, and we kill them without sparing; but whoever acknowledges our Heavenly Prince and exerts himself in our service shall have full reward—due honour and station in the armies and Court of the Heavenly Dynasty'" (Meadows, *The Chinese and Their Rebellions*, pp. 149f.).

"It is the policy of the Tai-pings to abstain as much as possible from extending their system of conscription, or the usual hardships of war, to the food *producing* classes. They command the personal services of all inhabitants of cities, whether men of wealth or tradesmen, and seize unhesitatingly the whole of their property, and they also press the produce *carriers*, the river boatmen. But, while they take possession of government corn stores as theirs by right, and probably do not spare the stores of large corn *merchants* in the towns they enter, it is certain that they purchase from the farmers, and make a point of giving liberal prices. The consequence is, that whenever the country people could find an opportunity of slipping unobserved into Chin-kiang with corn or vegetables they never failed to do so. The people of this village told me that the Imperialists, by whom the city was invested, subjected them to far more annoyance than the Tai-pings had done; but they spoke in very high terms of my old acquaintance, the Manchu Lin, as a commander who listened courteously to the complaints of the country people, and endeavoured to prevent excesses of the soldiery. When I questioned them about the new religion they made reproaches, in a very serious tone, against the Tai-pings for having 'sha, killed,' one particular idol-god on Silver Island whose name I regret not having entered in my journal. The destruction of the others was not after all a matter of great consequence, but their 'having sha ta, killed him,' was a proof of a very bad heart" (Written in 1853; *Ibid*, pp. 291f.).

that a government that could not protect them against a few thousand foreign troops might as well give place to a native one." And the Tai-pings aimed to establish just such a pure Chinese dynasty. Immediately upon taking Nanking, Hung Siu-tsuen was proclaimed Emperor of China, and assumed the style of royalty. Five chiefs were appointed, and the forces were cleverly organized. From Nanking the rebels controlled the Yang-tse valley, and cut off entirely the imperial dominion over at least seven provinces. They sent one army as far north as Tsing-hae, a few miles south of Tientsin, but this fell back without reaching Peking, which it had so closely approached.[1] After a time the imperial troops seemed to have hemmed them in, and to be on the point of capturing their capital, when the rebellion took on a new lease of life, the Arrow War absorbing the attention of the Government in its conflict with England and France. Two of the Tai-ping generals took Hang-chow and Soo-chow, the imperial forces in front of Nanking were scattered, and the rebels appeared at the gates of Shanghai. This roused the foreign community; the disorder of the country was destroying all trade; the Tai-pings were showing no capacity to set up an orderly government over the country they subdued and in which they destroyed the imperial power. The consequent intervention of foreign influence marked the beginning of the end, and the conclusion of the Arrow War left the Chinese Government free to turn all its energies to the suppression of the rebellion.

It is unnecessary to the main purpose of this study to describe the campaign which issued in the relief of Shanghai, the recapture of Hang-chow and Soo-chow, and the fall of Nanking. The outstanding figure in the conflict was General Charles G. Gordon, who got in this way his name of "Chinese" Gordon, and whose personal influence, military genius, courage and commanding character counted for as much in the suppression of the insurrection as all other forces combined. The glory of taking Nanking was left to the imperial army, Gordon perceiving that the real work was already done. The city fell on July 19th, 1864, the Tien Wang having three weeks before committed suicide by swallowing gold leaf "owing to his anxiety and trouble of mind." The Tai-pings fought bravely to the last, seven thousand being put to death, and the remainder fleeing after the fall of the city. Other armies in Che-kiang were in due time defeated, their survivors fleeing to the south, where fifteen years after its origin the last surges of the mighty upheaval died away in the provinces from which it had sprung.

---

[1] Meadows, *The Chinese and Their Rebellions*, pp. 175–188.

The Tai-ping Insurrection had set out to overthrow the dynasty, to destroy the idols, to suppress the curse of opium. It had shaken the dynasty, for a time stripping it from the income and sovereignty of the richest section of the Empire. It had demolished ten thousand temples and filled the Yang-tse river with dismantled gods. It had anathematized alike the sale and the use of the fearful drug which is eating out the life of China, had made opium smoking one of the sins against the Sixth Commandment, and proposed when it admitted foreigners freely to its dominions, as it contemplated doing when it had the throne, to make the one condition of their entrance that they should bring in no opium. And now the rebellion was at an end. The Manchus still sat upon the throne. The gods grinned in the temples, and the tablets stood stiffly in the schools, types of the rigidity of the system they deified. And a great Christian nation congratulated itself on the successful issue of another war which had fastened the opium fetters more securely than ever upon a land which at once craved and cursed them.

As we look back now over this powerful yet futile movement, shall we say that it was insincere and that its great leader was an impostor? One historian says of him, he was "a disappointed aspirant to office." At such a period it was not surprising that he should have become an enemy of the constituted authorities and of the Government. As he could not be the servant of the state, he set himself the ambitious task of being its master, and with this object in view he resorted to religious practices in order to acquire a popular reputation and a following among the masses.[1] This view is unworthy and unphilosophical. An impostor desirous of finding favour with the Chinese masses would not set out to destroy their idols and preach a doctrine of toleration of foreigners. It is impossible not to believe that at the outset Hung Siu-tsuen was an honest and courageous and sincere man, and that his first followers possessed the same spirit, and that even when their enterprise began to take an increasing political form, they were still sincere in their conviction that it was their duty to overturn the corrupt and usurping dynasty which imposed upon the Celestial Empire the rule of an alien race.[1]

---

[1] Boulger, *A Short History of China*, p. 237.

But though sincere, Hung Siu-tsuen was mistaken. The fact that he failed shows that he was mistaken, and his limitations indicate that he was not qualified to succeed. He failed to perceive certain great tactical necessities, like the capture of Shanghai and Peking. He was no political administrator. He failed to secure those who submitted against molestation, and to establish orderly government. Nanking itself was ruled by him, says Douglas, "without any regard for law and right, and presented a sordid scene of Oriental debauchery accompanied with all the intrigues and murders which usually belong to such a state. No man's life was safe for five minutes, and a reign of terror took possession of the followers of the Dynasty of Great Peace."[2] This is an extreme and exaggerated view, but Williams says soberly, that "as a revolution involving a reorganization of the Chinese nation on Christian principles, and a well-defined assertion of the rights and duties of rulers and subjects, it had failed entirely within a year after the possession of Nanking."[3]

And not only was Hung Siu-tsuen in error as to his mission, but also his conception of it and the man himself degenerated. Success was the worst enemy of the simple country school-teacher who twenty years before had received some tracts from an old man at the gate of the Examination Hall in Canton. Some of the earlier disciples left him when he became established in Nanking, among them Fung Yun-san, who had been Hung Siu-tsuen's best friend at the beginning. Possibly the change that had come over the movement and the man was distasteful to him. There was strife among the chiefs who remained, and one of them even claimed to be the Holy Ghost, and rebuked the Tien Wang for his cruelty to his wives and concubines. The leader himself withdrew more and more into seclusion, leaving the administration of affairs to others, while he indulged in ease, and led as some claim a careless and dissolute life. A missionary who visited his palace and was present at worship, testifies that the Tien Wang was worshipped with the Heavenly Father and the Elder Brother.[4]

---

[1] Ball, *Things Chinese*, p. 353.

[2] Douglas, *China*, p. 252f.

[3] Williams, *History of China*, p. 248.

[4] "To-day I had a conversation with the Rev. Mr. Holmes of the Baptist Mission, who has just returned from a visit to Nanking. He is not at all favourably

Prayers were said to him, and a fire was kept burning before his chair.[1] Yet even still it may be maintained that as a man he was a better man and of higher character than other Chinese, subject to like temptations, and that at the end he was still sincerely convinced of his divine mission. "In after days," says Williams, "his conviction of his own divine calling to rule China seems to have blinded his understanding to the spiritual nature of the Christian Church. His individual penchant was insufficient to resist or mould the subordinates who accepted his mission for their own ends. But he was not a tool in their hands at any time, and his personal influence permeated the ignorant mass of reckless men around him to an extraordinary degree, while his skill in turning some of the doctrines and requirements of the Bible as the ground and proofs of his own authority, indicated original genius, since the results were far beyond the reach of a cunning impostor." [2]

While the Tai-ping Rebellion was in progress the question of the right attitude of foreign nations towards it was a disputed question, and it is a debated issue still as to whether it was wise for Western nations to assist in putting it down.

In 1856 the Rev. W. A. P. Martin at that time a member of the Presbyterian Mission in Ningpo addressed to the Hon. Caleb Cush-

---

impressed with the chiefs. Our hopes in reference to the personal character of the Tien Wang are disappointed. His pride, and his arrogant assumptions, are insufferable. In some of his communications, he couples his own name with those of the Heavenly Father and the Heavenly Brother, Jesus, in a way which indicates that he regards himself as not much inferior to them. The tendency to depart further from the truth instead of drawing nearer to it, has always been a ground of fear in reference to the ultimate character of this movement, and though disappointed, we cannot be surprised. Nevertheless, whatever may come of this insurrection, it has struck a blow at the idolatry and superstition of China, the effects of which will not soon cease to be felt. Although I have always hoped, and still hope, for good from the religious truth circulated by the rebels, and especially from the circulation of the Bible among them, I have always felt that infinite wisdom alone could decide whether their political success would be a blessing or a curse to China. God has purposes to accomplish by them, and those purposes will be accomplished. . . .

"The foreign powers will very soon be compelled to decide upon some course of policy towards the rebels. The French are evidently anxious to attack and exterminate them, and the English may be induced to follow their lead. It requires no great amount of wisdom to see the folly of such a course" (*The Home and Foreign Record*, Vol. XII, Jan. 1861, pp. 18, 19, Journal of Rev. M. S. Culbertson.

[1] Hake, *The Story of Chinese Gordon*, p. 46.

[2] Williams, *History of China*, p. 233.

ing, Attorney-General of the United States, a long communication on the proper policy for the West to pursue with reference to the Rebellion. After discussing the origin of the movement, the causes which gave rise to it and the wonderful successes which attended the insurgents in the earlier stages of the war, and the existing condition of affairs among the insurgents and throughout the Empire, Dr. Martin wrote:

> "We should not allow ourselves to prejudge the results of war by the manner of conducting it, which with all its savageness, only preserves the analogy of Chinese history. . . . The guilt of war rests with those who provoke it, not with those who draw the sword to repel aggression, dethrone usurpers, or apply, it may be, the last remedy to an inefficient and oppressive administration. In the case before us, it was the usurpation and more recently, the misrule of the Manchus that drove the Chinese to revolt; and they only should be held responsible, both for the twenty-seven years of bloodshed which followed their invasion and for the perhaps equal period of civil carnage which must precede their expulsion. Whether such a consummation be desirable or otherwise, it is now too late to avoid it. The Manchu sovereignty is doomed, and the best that its well-wishers can expect for it, is a lingering death. The issue is no longer between a Tartar and a Chinese dynasty, but between the strong body of Nanking insurgents, which gives some promise of an energetic and united government and a hubbub of factions, which would lead to the establishment of rival and belligerent states. The march of the Tai-ping party may indeed be like the crushing progress of the car of Juggernaut, but there is no doubt that foreigners by aiding the Manchus to suppress the central insurrection, would only be rolling back those murderous wheels over vastly larger hectacombs of human life. Before going to other topics I should perhaps remark here, that nothing has done so much to inspire foreigners with aversion for the Insurgent cause, as the conduct of those lawless hordes which captured Amoy and Shanghai, and overran the province of Canton. But those were distinct and independent movements. They had for their object, not the establishment of the 'Celestial kingdom of Tai-ping,' but commenced with the avowed design of restoring the Ming dynasty—they observed none of the regulations of the Tai-ping party, and one of their most considerable bodies was actually led by a Buddhist priest. They should not, therefore, be confounded with the central party, who, their enemies themselves being judges, practice a strict morality, and observe a more rigid discipline than any other troops in the Empire. But even the unprincipled bands which come under the observation of foreigners at the open ports, never in their wildest excesses surpassed the rapine and cruelty of the Imperial braves; nor did the inhabitants of those ill-fated cities suffer so much from Insurgent violence, as from the licensed massacres and judicial butchery which followed their reversion to the legitimate authorities. On the score of humanity, therefore, no party has so little claim to sympathy and aid, as the existing government. . . .

"Latterly it has been hinted that the Insurgents are laying aside their profession of Christianity. This is, however, a groundless conjecture, thrown out with a design to disparage the revolution. Such an event is next to impossible in the nature of things. Christianity is so interwoven with the entire constitution of the party, that they cannot exclude it without hazarding its dissolution. . . .

"When a native and Christian party, for three years in actual possession of the chief cities on the great internal thoroughfare of this empire, are struggling for existence with a foreign pagan dynasty what, I ask, in view of the above principles, would it be, but national fratricide, for any Christian power to conspire with the Manchus to effect their extinction? Some will, perhaps, assert that the case is materially altered by the religion of the Insurgents being spurious. But when has Christianity in its incipient stages not presented the appearance of being spurious? The process both with nations and individuals is purgative. An artificial tinsel is soon worn off, but the heaven created bullion will at length purge away its grosser elements. Does the history of European nations teach no lesson on this subject? Was not the religion of the middle ages exceedingly crude and imperfect?—and yet light was made to shine out of darkness. To go back to the apostolic age, the irregularities of the Corinthian church would have been taken by the astute critics of the present day as proof of spuriousness, but an apostle did not hesitate to salute them as 'saints.' Or to go back to the apostles themselves, the sons of Zebedee, mistaking the nature of the kingdom of God and begging for seats, one on the right and the other on the left of the Messiah's throne, would no doubt have been condemned by the same squeamish judges, as self-interested and carnal adherents—but after farther illumination, who excelled them in spirituality and true devotion? But if Christians, notwithstanding these considerations persist in branding the religion of the Insurgents as spurious, who will assert that it may not become a most important auxiliary to the true? Taoism and Confucianism equally devoid of any religious principle, are at deadly antagonism with the Gospel. Is it not therefore an omen for Good, that a seedling from the tree of Life has shot up vigorous and strong, in the very midst of their noxious and entangled bramble? It might, indeed, if left to itself, produce insipid fruit, but will it not afford at least a root on which to engraft a scion from the parent stock? Thus, the success of the insurrection may be useful to the cause of Christianity, but its suppression cannot be otherwise than pernicious. This sentiment is eloquently expressed by the Bishop of Victoria, in a charge to the clergy of his diocese. 'If Britain,' says his lordship, 'bribed by the promise of extended privileges, which the passing away of their hour of danger would lead the faithless Manchus, as heretofore to evade and elude, should hereafter employ the resources of a joint-foreign intervention to restore the sinking fortunes of the Imperialists, then it may be confidently predicted that the civilization of this vast empire will be hopelessly postponed; and the conversion to Christianity of this people will (to human view) be indefinitely delayed. . . . The pæans of Manchu triumph will be the melancholy dirge of a vast nation, having her liberties entombed among the dead, and sinking into the lowest depths of political annihilation.' Christianity in the eyes of many of this people is always identified with the Insurgent cause; and while it prejudices them against the revolution, their animosity would, in the event of its failure (as they mistake for its cause that which is only a concomitant) recoil against foreigners, for causing them to 'suffer so many things in vain, if it be yet in vain.' Missionaries would be treated as political incendiaries and the Bible be proscribed as a dangerous book. Certain papal missionaries might perhaps exult in such a reverse to what they regard as Protestantism. But that would be the short-sighted folly of those Jewish partisans, who triumphed in the fall of a rival faction, while their city was besieged by a Roman army and their own doom sealed by the very event. It is not this or that creed, but our common Christianity that is at stake; and deeply as we may regret the fact—earnestly as we may reprobate the ambition, or fanaticism, which has imperilled our glorious cause, we cannot deny that the largest body of professed Christians in this empire are now in arms against the Government and it behooves us to beware, lest we involve all others in ruin, by abetting their defeat. It is in vain for Roman propagandists to flatter themselves that the Chinese will discriminate between their followers and the Insurgents. The sect of Heaven's Lord, is the only name for the Christian religion generally known throughout the empire. And when at the Five Ports we are still frequently addressed as its professors, is it to be wondered that the Insurgents should be taken (as I have been told by a soldier from the Imperial Camp they universally are) for disciples of the Lord of Heaven? The name of Jesus and their opposition to the vulgar idolatry are sufficient to establish their identity. Few in this land will inquire whether they receive or deny the dogmas of transubstantiation and the Pope's supremacy. All who possess even a modicum of intelligence will at once perceive that T'een-choo is only a synonym for Shang-ti; and minor differences will not be sufficient to constitute a distinction in a country where all hold to one God and one Saviour, are regarded as united in opposition to idolatry and atheism. I am sorry, therefore, that the Bishop of Peking has in a memorial to the Emperor, endeavoured to exculpate his co-religionists from the charge of being concerned in the rebellion, by hinting its probable connection with the Protestantism propagated at the Five Ports. The silence of the Emperor respecting that document, seems to indicate that he is little disposed to distinguish his Roman Catholic subjects by any favourable notice; but even if he had vouchsafed a favourable reply, that would have afforded no security that the author of that paper and his fellows will escape vengeance if ever the power of the revolutionary faction is broken. In Japan, a civil conflict, in which Romish converts were implicated, caused the cross to be trampled on and all missionaries, Protestant as well as Papist, to be excluded from those islands; and is it likely that the suppression of this insurrection, in which not only Protestant books, but the Holy Scriptures, the source of our common faith are concerned, may result in excluding Papists, as well as Protestants from China? Besides the fact that they are placed in this dilemma, it would be well for Papal missionaries and Papal governments to reflect that the Insurgents, as yet, know nothing of Luther and the

Reformation, and that they might now in their transition state, be moulded into any style of religious belief, with infinitely more facility than the conversion of callous heathens. And let no man deceive himself into the belief that though the visionary project of religious propagandists should be frustrated by the quelling of the insurrection, the interests of commerce would be unharmed by that catastrophe. Its inevitable effect would be to convince the Manchus of the incompatibility of the religion of foreigners, with the tranquillity of their empire; and so to confirm them in their suspicious and exclusive policy. On the other hand, the success of the Insurgents would be rich in commercial results. Having imported a foreign religion, they would soon appreciate the value of other imports; and having imbibed the spirit of Christianity, they would fraternize with foreigners really, as they now do nominally; and would in common with all Christendom, allow them 'ample means of access to their dominions for the purpose of trade; full right to reside therein, and to travel in their interior, as freely as the native inhabitants.' What a magnificent prospect would the Christianization of China open to mercantile enterprise? The progress of society would create a demand for the products of Western industry and repay them by developing the resources of this great country, in a way and to an extent, impossible under any other system.

"Thus, while this politico-religious conflagration, by consuming the rubbish which encumbers the ground, will present clear soil, on which both Papists and Protestants may sow their own seed, its extinction would endanger the exclusion of both—and while a revolution favourable to Christianity would vastly extend the range of commerce, a reaction could not fail to cramp and impede its prospective growth.

"A topic alluded to in my former letter, I cannot forbear resuming in this place. Every one must perceive at a glance the immense advantages resulting from having Nanking made the capital of the empire instead of Peking. The latter is a several days' journey from a shallow dangerous coast; the former is near the mouth of the Asiatic Amazon, where the largest three-deckers may ride in safety. If the imperial residence collects two millions of people at Peking, where they must be fed by grain, transported from the south; what an immense population would it not attract to Nanking, in the very heart of the grain-growing region, where the head waters of the Yang-tse pour down the trade of half the nation, and the winds from the ocean would waft in the riches of the sea. That change would make it what Peking can never be, the emporium of Western commerce and the centre of new civilization. It would be such a felicitous exchange as that of Moscow for St. Petersburg, and of Delhi for Calcutta. What language, then, is strong enough to characterize the folly which would purchase the navigation of that noble stream, by driving the court of the new dynasty away from the banks? This, I understand is one of the advantages expected from the renewal of our treaty, but it is an advantage which the Tartar emperor has not the power to confer; but if we must, after all, take it by force, where is the necessity of asking his leave? And as to other privileges, he has little to grant that is worth asking for, unless it be access to Peking and Shinking, which he certainly will not concede, until they are as much out of his possession as Nanking now is. *Hoping*, therefore, that all Christian powers will refrain from helping an illiberal, effete, pagan and foreign dynasty, to overcome its worthier rival, and that the first American treaty with China will be the last with its Tartar rulers, etc., etc."[1]

All the Tai-pings asked was neutrality. They believed that if foreign Powers would refrain from interfering, they would carry their cause to success, and many then agreed with them, and agree still. "The repeated defeats and complete discomfiture of the Tartar hosts in the north have thoroughly undermined the Manchu power," wrote Griffith John at the time. "It must fall. There is no power in China to uphold it. The Kwang-si insurrection must triumph if foreign Powers do not interfere. The Manchus might as well attempt to blow the sun out of the heavens, as to quench this flame which their folly and tyranny have kindled."[2] But the Western Powers did intervene. When the Tai-pings were on the point of capturing Shanghai they were driven off by English and French troops, and later it was by means of the "Ever Victorious Army" which contained a number of foreigners, and was commanded by foreigners, in the case of Gordon by an officer loaned to the Chinese Government for the purpose, that the Tai-ping horde which had rolled down to the sea, was pushed back upon itself and finally stayed and overwhelmed. Was it wise for the West to do this?[3]

The reasons in favour of the suppression of the rebellion were evident and convincing. In the first place, it had been and was still truly a great devastation, leaving ruin and anarchy in its train. It destroyed industry and agriculture, it spread famine and pestilence, it filled the land with brigandage, crime and massacre. As the Imperial rescript on the report of Hung Siu-tsuen's death said: "Words cannot convey any idea of the misery and desolation he caused; the measure of his iniquity was full and the wrath of both gods and men was roused against him." The heaps of ruins within the walls of

---

[1] *The Home and Foreign Record*, Jan., 1857, pp. 20-22; Feb., 1857, pp. 54, 55.

[2] Robson, *Griffith John*, p. 51.

[3] Dr. Legge did not believe that it was. While recognizing clearly the moral faults of the Rebellion, he strongly disapproved of European interference. This view was set forth in a letter to the London Missionary Society which will be found in the supplement to this chapter, pp. 66-70.

Soo-chow and Nanking testify to this day of the desolation which in those days lay over the whole valley of the Yang-tse and peopled the villages which were once prosperous and flourishing, only with the beggars and the dead. This was the desolation not of war alone, but of heartless cruelty and wanton destruction. "It was sickening," writes Wells Williams to his wife, from Shanghai on May 15, 1862, speaking of the conduct of the rebels in Ningpo, "to hear the tales of murder, rapine, burning, and destruction, everywhere following in the trail of the Tai-pings, most of whose troops and many of whose leaders are mere boys under eighteen, that have been caught and trained to deeds of infamy and blood, in which they soon become reckless,"[1] but he adds, "Rankin (a Presbyterian missionary) speaks of great interest in the Gospel among some of the villages not far from the city, and says that the rebels have put no hindrance in the way of his work."[2]

A second reason for the suppression of the rebels was that even if in power there was no prospect that they would govern any better than the existing dynasty, while the Manchus, it was supposed, had now as a result of the Opium and Arrow Wars, come to understand that foreign intercourse was inevitable and would enter upon satisfactory relations with the West. In spite of the promises of the rebels and their apparently favourable attitude towards foreigners, it seemed safer to try to hold what had already been gained from the existing dynasty. It was believed, moreover, that there was better hope of tranquillity and that the people as a whole would be more contented if the old order should continue; while the rebels were entirely untrustworthy. "I had no faith," writes Williams, in 1864, "in this rebellion from the outset, as likely to form a means of promoting the truth, for there was no adequate cause for insuring such a result, while the conduct of the rebels during the last five years has shown a ruthlessness and fanaticism enormously greater than when they began their course of slaughter in 1850." [1]

---

[1] Williams, *Life and Letters of S. Wells Williams*, p. 336.

[2] In January, 1862, the Rev. D. D. Green wrote from Ningpo, then in possession of the rebels:

"With reference to our prospects here, there is a dark and a bright side. The dark side is the human side, the bright is the heavenly. Should the insurgents leave or be driven out of this place, the miseries of the people will be written in blood and cruelty, and it must be a long time before we can be where we were two or three months since. If the insurgents remain here the prospect is even worse, because

"1st. All heavy commerce is at a standstill, and trade cannot revive because of the military despotism of the leaders of this movement here, and of the savage hordes which, partly at the will of these leaders, and partly in defiance of their authority and commands, devastate the country, carry off such as they choose of the people, and subject all to a rule of violence. Hitherto, they have been on good terms with, and seemed really desirous of keeping in the good graces of foreigners.

"2d. The present troubles at Shanghai, and the yet undetermined or noncommittal manner with reference to their future treatment of foreigners here, in case they do not have entire sway, to my own mind augurs no good. It is the opinion of some of those who have been here the longest, that if they had the power they would bitterly persecute everybody who did not exactly square with their ideas. This may yet be their course, or it may not. This is at least true, that they neither have power to restore commercial confidence, nor have much desire for the truth as it is in Jesus. They have great powers of destruction, but no power to build up" (*The Home and Foreign Record*, Vol. xiii, May, 1862, pp. 143f.).

A third source of hostility to the Tai-pings lay in their unrelenting iconoclasm. This enraged the Roman Catholics as well as many Chinese against them. One of the Catholic Bishops issued a proclamation entitled a "Memorial to the Throne," in which he "vindicated his co-religionists from suspicion of complicity by denouncing the insurgents as converts to Protestantism;" and this hostility had as will be seen, a real relation to the attitude of foreign governments to the rebel government.[2]

And lastly there was the omnipotent argument of trade. The rebels were threatening Shanghai itself. They stringently prohibited the trade in opium, and that was not likely to make them popular with the British merchants. And of course trade was dead in the regions which they had devastated. This was too much for the West to bear, and intervention which would not have come from sympathy with the Manchu dynasty or the Chinese people, at once resulted from pressure upon the tender nerve of Western desire for gain.

It is easy to understand how these considerations combined served to justify the suppression of this supreme rising against the Tartar throne. Moreover, men say, the rebellion was suppressed. History has simply closed the question and it is folly to reopen the settled judgments of destiny. Whatever happens, happens by the will of God. The Tai-pings fell.

---

[1] Williams, *Life and Letters of S. Wells Williams*, p. 356.

[2] Martin, *A Cycle of Cathay*, pp. 140f.

But the question cannot be answered in this simple and summary way, and buried questions of the past have a way of reviving and demanding fresh reply. In the first place, as Dr. Martin says, "the suppression of a revolution by force *ab extra* always reverses the wheels of progress." This movement apart from its religious character was representative of the immense discontent which prevails in China against the foreign rule of the Manchus. The intervention of the West suppressed the movement, but it did not reform or replace the Manchu dynasty. It simply drove the symptoms of a virulent disease back into the system again. The West has always dealt with China in this unjust way. It has forced great changes upon China or has prevented great changes from taking place in China, and then has declined to assume any of the responsibility for its course and has reviled China for the consequences.

In the second place, it is contended that the cruelty and ruin of the Tai-ping Rebellion were no greater than the cruelty and ruin of other Chinese rebellions. The only difference between it and the Nien-fei and Mohammedan rebellions that followed, was a difference of quantity, not of kind. The Manchus were just as relentless and merciless when they usurped the throne, and the struggle lasted longer than the Rebellion, and with the Manchus it was usurpation. With the Tai-pings it was patriotic struggle for national independence. And even in the struggle the imperial troops were as responsible for the effects as were the Tai-pings. At the outset they were even more cruel and implacable. The Tai-ping Rebellion, judged by Western standards, was horrible. But so also is the Manchu government. It is inconsistent to suppress a rebellion for evils which are tolerated in an organized government. It may be doubted whether the heart and hands of Hung Siu-tsuen, Tai-ping Emperor at Nanking, the friend of foreigners, are not cleaner and more innocent than the heart and hands of Tsi An, Dowager Empress at Peking, the accomplice in the murder of hundreds of missionaries and thousands of native Christians. And the former was tumbled from the throne by Western Powers, and the latter is recognized and sustained there.

In the third place, as history has shown, the position of Western Nations and Western traders under a Tai-ping dynasty could scarcely have been worse than it has been under the Manchus, and it might have been vastly better.[1] Williams, in spite of his later declaration that he had never seen any promise of good in the movement, wrote to his brother in 1853, "I have hopes of the movement resulting in good at last, and even to this generation, but there must come a vast deal of suffering to all parts of China from the dislocation of the old order of things. . . . There are reasonable grounds for hoping, when these rebels become rulers, for much better days in China than the Manchu Government allows us at present. But I fear a long day of misrule ere this comes about."[2] But surely there could hardly be worse misrule than there is in Turkey and Persia to-day. Yet the Western Nations complacently endure this, and accredit ministers and ambassadors to these countries. The Tai-ping movement did mean suffering, as the Manchu Government meant suffering; but the former was acute with, as some believed, a prospect of permanent improvement, while the latter was chronic with no prospect. And although the Tai-pings had no scheme of administration wrought out, some hoped to the last that this would have been developed out of what was endurable in the old order, while the Tai-pings would have had the immense help of an open attitude towards assistance from without, which the Manchu rulers utterly lacked. Thus in the Tai-ping *Commentary on the Ten Words*, it is said:

---

[1] "I, while condemning all intervention whatever either for or against the Tai-pings, nevertheless do feel politically desirous for their success. Their claims of supremacy for their sovereign are in nowise more exaggerated than those of the Manchus, whom they are endeavouring to oust. The present dynasty continues, notwithstanding the British war and in opposition to the spirit of the treaties, pertinaciously to act on the old national policy of 'making a distinction between natives and barbarians,' of 'avoiding friendly relations' with the latter, and of 'keeping them off.' The Tai-pings on the other hand, apart from the claim to supremacy, have, by the testimony of all who have visited them, manifested a decidedly friendly feeling. Though the successive visits had the effect of modifying this feeling on the part of the leaders so far as to make them at length begin applying to us the term 'barbarian,' there still remained the essential circumstance that they called us 'barbarian brethren,' a conjunction in which the first word is necessarily much modified by the second. And, what is of most importance, they are themselves, in certain of their fundamental religious doctrines, sedulously diffusing principles by which that very claim to supremacy, which they now urge, will be overthrown in the minds of their own people, with their future certain increase in geographical and historical knowledge. Hence, with the establishment of the Tai-pings, foreigners will be in no respect worse placed as to all legitimate international objects than they were before, while a broad and firm basis will be laid for the assimilation of national fundamental beliefs and for a consequent peaceable extension of free intercourse and commercial privileges. The last fifteen years' experience has finally proved that these advantages can be obtained from the present dynasty only by wars, bloody and disastrous for the Chinese; wars engendering long national hatred and tending directly to destroy that very national industry which alone makes commercial intercourse valuable" (Meadows, *The Chinese and Their Rebellions*, pp. 324f.).

[2] Williams, *Life and Letters of S. Wells Williams*, pp. 201f.

> "The whole world is one family and all men are brethren.
> How can they be permitted to kill and destroy one another?"

This is very different from the view of the Tartar Government. "All dealings with foreigners are detestable." The words are from a popular proclamation, but the spirit is the spirit of the dynasty which Hung sought to overthrow. The Tai-pings on the other hand, were always cordial to foreigners, assured them both at Ningpo and elsewhere, that they would not be molested, and maintained this attitude "notwithstanding their intercourse with and treatment by foreign nations was calculated to embitter their minds and give rise to resentment and retaliation." [1]

And, fourthly, from the point of view of missions there was and has always been great doubt as to whether it might not have been better to let the Tai-pings alone.

They had made the Bible their book of authority. The Confucian Classics gave way to it. The significance of this, if the Tai-pings continued to reverence and study the Bible, it was impossible to exaggerate. Mr. Meadows endeavoured to impress this upon the West, at the time, when the rebels had established themselves at Nanking.

> "THE EASTERN PRINCE HAS STATED, IN WRITING, THAT UNDER THE RULE OF THE TAI-PINGS, THE BIBLE WILL BE SUBSTITUTED FOR THE SACRED BOOKS OF CONFUCIANISM AS THE TEXT-BOOK IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE EXAMINATIONS.
>
> "In spite of my capitals, and in spite of my having dwelt so often, and with so much emphasis on the influence of these examinations, as the free avenue to the thousands of posts in the empire from district magistracies to premierships; and notwithstanding that I now remind the reader of the stirring effect, that the opening to competition of but forty places a year in the exile of tropical India, has already had on every higher educational establishment of the British Isles;—in spite of and notwithstanding all this, I fairly despair of imparting an adequate idea of the importance of that resolve of the Tai-pings, nor of the immense significance which it gives to the piece of yellow shading in the middle of the accompanying map of China. Upon the gradual extension or diminution of that piece of shading, during the next ensuing years, it depends whether or not, in a prosperous population of 360,000,000 of heathens, all the males who have the means, and

---

[1] Nevius, *China and the Chinese*, p. 425.

> are not too old to learn—all the males from boyhood to twenty-five or thirty years of age who can devote their time to study—will be assiduously engaged in getting the Bible off by heart, from beginning to end. Should the thing take place, it will form a revolution as unparalleled in the world for rapidity, completeness, and extent as is the Chinese people itself for its antiquity, unity and numbers. . . .
>
> "My conviction is, that the Tai-ping Government would, once fairly in secure possession of the sovereign power, itself be foremost in encouraging the study and translation of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, and that it would appoint a commision for that purpose. . . . If the Tai-pings succeed, then 480,000,000 of human beings, out of the 900,000,000 that inhabit the earth, will profess Christianity, and take the Bible as the standard of their beliefs; and these 480,000,000 will comprise precisely the most energetic and most civilized half of the human race."[1]

Even so late as 1860, four years before the collapse of the Rebellion, Dr. Nevius held a hopeful view of the movement in this matter of its relations to the Bible.

> "Inexcusable as the general course of the insurgents is, God is making them the instrument of punishing this nation for its long continued and gross idolatry; and may we not hope of weakening the superstitions of the people, and helping to prepare them for the reception of the pure gospel. Great allowances should be made for those who are themselves just emerging from heathenism, who have no teachers, who have always been subject to the demoralizing influences of war, and whose policy and practice are necessarily modified by the lawless spirits which swell their armies, and which no authority can control. The fact that God's Word is still preserved by them, and regarded with unabated veneration, is full of promise. It is said that during their brief occupation of Hangchow, they had already begun to talk about having public examinations there, on themes taken from the Scriptures. Is it unreasonable to hope that the divine light of God's word, will, ere long, burst forth with its inherent brightness, dispelling the darkness by which it is surrounded, and making the end of this mysterious and unprecedented movement as unexpected and extraordinary as its beginning?"[2]

To be sure there was a great deal that was un-Christian in the spirit, and purposes and methods of the Tai-pings. They mixed pagan and Mohammedan elements with the Old Testament and the Gospels in an astounding and confusing way; but there were many sincere and earnest men among them who undoubtedly sought the good of China, and had hold of some real elements of Christian truth, and the spirit of the movement was on the whole sympathetic towards missionaries and their religion. Hung Siu-tsuen showed no more resentment on account of Mr. Roberts' refusal to baptize him than might be inferred from his course of acting without consultation with missionaries or seeking their approval or advice. And yet even this course was not without exception; for when the new court was established in Nanking, Mr. Roberts was invited to take office under the new Government and went to Nanking for this purpose, but Hung Siu-tsuen did not even grant him an interview, and finding that he could accomplish nothing, and that his position was unpleasant and dangerous, he "left Nanking in disgust," says Dr. Nevius,[1] and "was glad to escape to Shanghai with his life," says Williams.[2]

---

[1] Meadows, *The Chinese and Their Rebellions*, pp. 446, 448, 449.

[2] *The Home and Foreign Record*, Vol. XI, October, 1860, p. 308. Letter from the Rev. J. L. Nevius.

Different missionaries who visited Nanking in 1861 came away with different impressions of the hopefulness of the Rebellion in a missionary interest. Dr. D. B. McCartee went with an American naval vessel to secure certain guarantees from the Tai-ping leader and was not favourably impressed, though the mission was successful.

> "Our mission was a delicate one, namely, to obtain a formal document under seal, guaranteeing to our citizens and their property security from molestation or loss, without formally recognizing the insurgents or giving them an official document in return. Yet, by the favour of God, we succeeded in doing so well that if the insurgents perform what they have promised, the expedition will not prove to have been a fruitless one, either to our merchants or our missionaries.
>
> "We were courteously treated, accepted an invitation to dine with these kings, or *princes* as Wang might be more properly translated, one of whom afterwards came down and visited us on board the *Hartford* on Monday following. Saving and excepting a blessing was asked by the young prince who sat at the head of our table, and the inscriptions on the houses, I saw no signs of anything resembling Christianity in or near Nanking, although the young prince told me it was their Sabbath. I saw and heard no religious worship, save the firing of some fire-crackers, which I was told was done in worshipping the Heavenly Father. The shop-keepers, boatmen, and labourers seemed to know no Sabbath, nor had the council of state ceased from business on the day they call by that name. The Cantonese in the junks lying off the city went through apparently the same kind of gong-beating and burning of papers and fire-crackers as in the other parts of China. . . . No wine was offered us at Tsan Wang's palace, and we were

---

[1] *China and the Chinese*, p. 425.

[2] *History of China*, p. 270.

> told they did not think it right to drink. Yet a gentleman who passed some time in the palace of Kan Wang told me that that dignitary drank it habitually; and Moh Wang, during his visit on board the *Hartford*, drank a sufficient quantity of sherry and champagne, and with sufficient imperturbability, to show that he was either no stranger to the habit, or that he possessed remarkable natural powers in that line at least. Boats came alongside the *Saginaw* at night, wishing to buy opium, and many countenances among the insurgents indicated that they were no strangers to that drug.
>
> ". . . As to the literary acquirements of the councillors, I saw sufficient to convince me that they were of very moderate pretensions, and they themselves, when in session, had the air of a group of village tavern politicians. When Moh Wang and Liang visited the *Hartford*, the theatrical airs assumed by them, particularly by the latter, were exceedingly ridiculous and absurd. I could not find that they were publishing the sacred Scriptures at present. I got a copy from the young prince Tsau-tsz-kiun, but it proved an old edition and imperfect."[1]

Others besides Dr. McCartee had their faith in the likelihood of any good result from the Rebellion shaken by the condition prevailing at Nanking and in other cities[2] where the Rebels were in power. The Rev. A. P. Happer wrote from Canton:

> "I have stood alone amongst the members of our missions in China in exposing the dangerous errors of the insurgents of Nanking. The true nature of these views I suppose will now be admitted by all. In addition to the testimony of Mr. Holmes, we have now the testimony of the Rev. G. John, of the London Missionary Society, at Shanghai, who spent a month at Nanking, and published an account of his visit in the *North China Herald*. Mr. John states that the insurgent chief had sent a communication to Mr. Roberts, who is at Nanking, in which he reiterates the statement, that, in 1837, he ascended to heaven and saw the heavenly father, brother, mother, and sister, and that they have all come down times without number. Mr. John says: 'He tells Mr. Roberts he must believe in all this without reserve, or perish as the Israelites did who rejected Moses.' He then explains that he is the son of God in the same sense that Christ is; that the matter of being born of different mothers was of no moment, as they were of the same father. After the statement of the greatest errors, he tells Mr. Roberts 'that faith in these things is very important to him, and that without it, he can be neither useful here, nor happy hereafter.' He wants Mr. Roberts to become his pupil. In a public document, he declares that 'it is a great error to say that Jesus is equal to the Father;' that the Arians were right who taught

---

[1] *The Home and Foreign Record*, Vol. XII, Nov., 1861, p. 337. Art. "Narrative by Dr. McCartee."

[2] With reference, for example, to the judgment of the Ningpo missionaries *see The Missionary Magazine* (Baptist), May, 1862, pp. 136–139; Nov., 1862, p. 417; Apr., 1863, p. 97.

that Christ was inferior. The man who is now styled by them Kan Wang, who was so long with Dr. Legge and Mr. Chalmers of the London Mission, has written a long communication to Dr. Legge and Mr. Chalmers. I have seen but I have not read it all. But Mr. Chalmers, who has translated it all, says that from it, it is clear they do not wish missionaries to come to the cities where they are, as the teaching of missionaries that Christ is the *only* Son of God, and on other points, would come in conflict with the teachings of the chiefs. . . .

"What God, in His infinite wisdom, may permit to come of this blasphemy, no one can foresee; but, certainly, no Christian man, with this present amount of evidence as to the nature and purport of their teaching, can wisely have any sympathy with them."[1]

---

[1] *The Home and Foreign Record*, May, 1861, Vol. XII, p. 147. Letter of the Rev. A. P. Happer.

Even at this time, however, others nearer at hand continued to hold a more favourable view. A writer in the *North China Herald* said: "It appears evident that the religious element enters very powerfully into this great revolutionary movement. Nothing can be more erroneous than the supposition that it is purely a political one, and that religion occupies but a subordinate place in it. So far is this from being the case, that, on the contrary, it is the basis upon which the former rests, and is its life-perpetuating source. The downfall of idolatry, and the establishment of the worship of the true God, are objects aimed at by them with as much sincerity and devotion as the expulsion of the Manchus and the conquest of the empire. In opposition to the pantheistic notions of the philosophers of the Sung dynasty, they hold the doctrine of the personality of the Deity; in opposition to the popular polytheistic notions, they have the clearest conception of the unity of God; and in opposition to the fatalism of philosophical Buddhism, they believe in and teach the doctrine of an all-superintending Providence. This appears on the very surface, and no one can be among them any length of time without being impressed with it. They feel that they have a work to accomplish, and the deep conviction that they are guided by an unerring finger, and supported by an omnipotent arm in its execution, is their inspiration. Success they ascribe to the goodness of the Heavenly Father, and defeat to His chastisements. The Deity is, with them, not an abstract notion, nor a stern implacable sovereign, but a loving father, who watches tenderly over their affairs, and leads them by the hand. The Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are their standard of faith now, as they were at the commencement of the movement. They often speak of the death of Christ as atoning for the sins of the whole world, though they do not seem to have a clear notion of the *divinity* of His person. They regard Him as the greatest human being that has ever appeared in this world, and as *specially* the Godsent; and this will account for the revolutionary chief styling himself the *brother* of Christ. He does not suppose that he himself is divine; his idea, probably, is, that the Saviour is the greatest of God's messengers, and he himself the second. On this point, as well as on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, he needs enlightenment. Could he be convinced that Christ is divine as well as human, he would immediately see, and perhaps renounce his error. That errors have crept in, is not surprising; on the contrary, it would be one of the greatest miracles on record were it otherwise. The amount of religious knowledge diffused among the people is necessarily limited; that of the chiefs, though not very profound, is more extensive.

"The feeling which they entertained towards foreigners is apparently of the most friendly nature; they are always addressed as 'our foreign brethren; we

But this same year, 1861, the Rev. W. Muirhead of the London Missionary Society, visited Nanking, and made a report in which he spoke with respect of what he found there. War had left its ruinous marks on the city, and Dr. Muirhead recognized that there were grave moral evils in the movement, but he believed that "still, the *régime* he (Hung-Siu-tsuen) has brought to bear upon his countrymen, is so far calculated to spread the knowledge of Christianity, and thus lay the foundation for a purer and more spiritual church than he is attempting to establish." Mr. Roberts was in Nanking at the time, and Mr. Muirhead stayed with him. The Kan Wang talked with him of the Tai-ping plans:

> "He stated that the desire of his royal master was to evangelize the country; and when I asked if that was their mutual intention, he at once replied, most certainly it was; the thing had been contemplated from the first, and would be strenuously followed out. But it was necessary to observe, he added, that the king intended to prosecute this object in his own way. 'In what way?' I asked. 'By native means,' he said. Examinations would be made annually, at which all the public officers would be present. The text-book, on such occasions, would be chiefly the Bible; and according to the attainments of the writers in Scriptural knowledge would their respective positions in the empire be determined. The successful essayists would be appointed to certain offices, and in each, large and small, would regular instruction be communicated to all around. I observed that something more than that was required, in view of ascertaining the religious character

> worship the same Heavenly Father, and believe in the same Elder Brother, why should we be at variance?' They seem to be anxious for intercourse with foreigners, and desirous to promote the interests of trade. The opening up of the eighteen provinces to trade, they say, would be most pleasing to them.
>
> "A great deal has been said about the cruelty of the 'long-haired rebels,' but this is a false accusation. In no instance have we witnessed any traces of willful destruction. It is true they kill, but it is because they must do so or submit to be killed. They burn, but so far as our observation went, it is invariably in self-defence. Much of the burning is done by the imperialists before the arrival of the rebels, and the cases of suicide are far more numerous than those of murder. The fact that all the women have been allowed to leave Sung Kiang, and that they are known, in many cases, to have made attempts to save men and women who had plunged themselves into the canals and rivers, is a proof they are not the cruel, relentless marauders that they have been represented to be by many. They are revolutionists in the strictest sense of the term; both the work of slaughter and plunder are carried on only so far as is necessary to secure the end.
>
> "As to their general moral character, we are scarcely able to give an opinion. Probably, taking them *en masse*, they are not much superior to their fellow-countrymen in this respect. Though the use of opium is legally forbidden, yet we know that it is largely consumed by them. Both the common soldiers and many of the chiefs partake of it freely" (*The Home and Foreign Record*, Vol. XI, December, 1860, pp. 372, 373. Quoted from the *North China Herald*).

of the candidates, and for promoting the ends and objects of a spiritual kingdom. He replied that such was the scheme contemplated by the 'heavenly king,' and that it was supposed by him to be a complete one. 'Well, then,' it was asked, 'what position would foreign teachers have in the case?' He stated that, at first, they would be useful in diffusing among the scholars and people a general knowledge of Christianity; but the fact was, that the king did not like the idea of depending on foreign aid in the matter. He thought that the thing could be done by Chinese themselves, who were naturally proud, and not disposed to accept the Gospel at the hands of foreigners. He was desirous of being friendly with us; but there was such a variety of sentiment among us, and the simple fact of our being what we are, determined him to follow his own course.

"I spoke further to the Kan Wang on the subject of missionaries coming to reside at the capital. He answered, in a very friendly way, that he would not advise it, at least in the meantime. The place was nothing else than a camp. Though he would be glad to see a few of his special friends now and then, yet he could not encourage the idea of the metropolis being made the centre of missionary operations, at all events at present. It was impossible to provide houses here, and it were better, in his view, to work our way gradually from Soo-chow upwards. However, he said, 'If any one feels himself imperatively called upon by God to undertake a mission to this place, let him come by all means, but do not ask *me* in the matter.' He repeated these words in an emphatic manner, on the understanding that they should be told abroad.

". . . While walking along the streets," added Mr. Muirhead, "the number of females that are seen on the way is rather a novelty. They are in general well dressed, and of very respectable appearance. Many are riding on horseback, others are walking, and most of them have large feet. Not a few stop to hear our preaching, and always conduct themselves with perfect propriety. This is new, as compared with the former course of things, and the whole reminds one partly of home life. It will be a blessing if the revolution should tend to break up the system of female seclusion, hitherto practiced.

"And now a word or two, with regard to the character and prospects of the movement. Those engaged in it speak not boastfully, but calmly and confidently of its success. They acknowledge the difficulties in the way, yet believe in the Lord God that they shall be established. They do not apprehend it will be an easy thing to overcome their enemies; but fighting, as they think, under the banners of the Heavenly Father and Heavenly Brother, they contemplate a happy issue as a matter of course. As Kan Wang's followers were assembling in front of his palace, a young man came up-stairs. I asked him if he was going out to join the army. He said 'Yes.' 'Was he not afraid of being wounded or killed?' 'Oh, no,' he replied, 'the Heavenly Father will befriend me.' 'Well, but suppose you should be killed, what then?' 'Why, my soul will go to heaven.' 'How can you expect to go to heaven?' 'What merit have you to get there?' 'None, none in myself. It is entirely through the merits of the Heavenly Brother that this is to be done.' 'Who is the Heavenly Brother?' 'I am not very learned,' he said, 'and request instruction.' I then began to tell that He was the Son of the Heavenly Father; but before I had finished the sentence, he replied correctly. 'What great work did Christ do?' I asked. The young man gave an explicit statement of the Saviour's work for sinners, of His coming into the world, suffering and dying in the room of sinful men, in order to redeem us from sin and misery. I inquired if he believed all this. 'Assuredly,' was his reply. 'When did you join the dynasty?' 'Last year.' 'Can you read?' 'No.' 'Who instructed you in these things?' 'The Tsan Wang.' 'What does he in the way of instructing his people?' 'He has daily service in his palace, and often preaches to them alike at home and when engaged in the field.' 'What book does he use?' 'He has a number belonging to the dynasty.' 'Do you know the New Testament?' 'Yes, but cannot read it.' 'Can you repeat the doxology of the Heavenly Father?' He went over it correctly. It contains in simple language the fundamental tenets of Christianity. 'Are there any special laws or commands connected with the dynasty?' 'There are the Ten Commandments.' 'Repeat them.' He went over a number of them till he came to the sixth. 'Now,' I said, 'how is this command observed by you, seeing that so much cruelty and wickedness are practiced by your brethren all around?' 'Oh,' he replied, 'in so far as fighting in the open field is concerned, that is all fair play and cannot be helped. It is not intended in the command.' 'No,' I remarked, 'that is not my meaning; but look at your brethren going privately into the country and robbing and killing the innocent people; what of that?' 'It is very bad, and such will only go to hell.' 'What, notwithstanding their adherence to the dynasty, and fighting under the same banners as yourself?' 'Yes, that is no matter; when the laws of Christ and the Heavenly Father are not attended to, these guilty individuals ought to die and go to hell.' 'But is not this the case with a great number of your adherents?' 'Alas; it is especially among our new recruits, whose hearts are not impressed with the true doctrine.' 'In all the public offices is care taken to instruct the soldiers and civilians connected with them?' 'Yes, every man, woman and child of a reasonable age in the capital can repeat the doxology of the Heavenly Father.' 'And what about those in the country?' 'Those who have short hair are not yet sufficiently taught, but books are being distributed among them, in order that they may learn those things.'

"Such in brief is a faithful transcript of what I have seen and heard in the course of my ten days' visit to this place. When I began to write, it seemed impossible to record a tithe of all that had transpired. Incidents without number appeared to crowd upon my mind, so as to debar all idea of entering into details. The whole may be regarded by you as rather prolix, but you have it such as it is, and I close with a few thoughts in the way of

"GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.

"I. We cannot but acknowledge that by means of the Tai-ping chiefs, a gratifying amount of Bible truth has been diffused among their numerous adherents. True, it is limited, and mingled with much that is erroneous and blas-

> phemous; still, the continued and extensive employment of the same means would tend much to spread a knowledge of the cardinal truths of Christianity.
>
> "II. We cannot but believe that the rebellion, even if ultimately unsuccessful, has inflicted a death-blow on idolatry and superstition in many parts of the country, which will be of service when other means are employed, in the providence of God, for the overthrow of 'Satan's seat' in this land. Such indignation has been shown to the idols, that the reverence of fear once entertained in regard to them can never be revived in the minds of their former worshippers, etc."[1]

The attitude of the best of Hung Siu-tsuen's generals was distinctly favourable and encouraging. A party of missionaries visited the Chung Wang, Li Sên-cheng, at Soo-chow, and were hospitably received. "The missionaries told the king the object of their visit, and he mentioned several leading Christian doctrines, and was satisfied to find that Western Nations believed in them. . . . He asked if they had other subjects to bring forward, and they said that some of their countrymen were engaged in trade. It would be satisfactory if the silk trade in the provinces occupied by his troops were not obstructed. He replied that the Celestial King desired this and would levy customs accordingly. He willingly accepted a present of Bibles and books, and invited the party to remain for a few days. . . . They observed that the Tai-pings had destroyed the idols everywhere, and on the walls of the Temple at Pa-chih was a proclamation exhorting the people to desert bad superstition, and worship the Heavenly Father, and also to bring tribute to the ruler of the new dynasty. If they acted thus they would be well treated, otherwise they must expect punishment."[2] The rebel leaders were cordial and hospitable. They called the missionaries "our foreign brethren," saying, "we worship the same Heavenly Father and believe in the same Elder Brother, why should we be at variance?"

Some time later, Griffith John and Dr. Edkins were invited to Soochow to see the Kan Wang or Shield King, Hung Jin. Hung Jin had been a native preacher in Hongkong under the London Missionary Society. He was a cousin of Hung Siu-tsuen and had gone to Nanking to preach the pure Gospel among the Tai-pings; but Hung Siu-tsuen insisted on making him one of the leaders. He was both a sincere Christian and a sincere Tai-ping, and hoped by the victory of the

---

[1] *The Foreign Missionary*, September, 1861, pp. 114–123.

[2] Robson, *Griffith John*, p. 41.

Tai-pings to open the whole of China to Christianity. He made many inquiries of the missionaries, and rejoiced to hear of the converts in China, and of the revival in the West at that time, 1860. "The Kingdom of Christ," he told them, "must spread and overcome every opposition. Whatever may become of the celestial dynasty, there can be no doubt concerning this matter." He laid aside his robes and invited the missionaries to dinner. Before dinner he suggested that they should sing a hymn and pray. He chose one of Dr. Medhurst's hymns, started it, and sang with real earnestness. The talk was wholly upon religion. At their meeting the following day he protested against the course of the representatives of foreign Powers in returning his letters as an insult, and against the British and French occupation of Shanghai as a breach of neutrality. They then sang and prayed, the Kan Wang praying that pure Christianity might soon become the religion of China. It was shortly after this that the Tai-ping forces were resisted at Shanghai by foreign troops, greatly to their amazement, it was said by some,—the Tai-pings regarding the foreign powers with friendliness, and supposing that they were to remain neutral. Even after this, however, Mr. John and another missionary visited Nanking in 1860, and obtained an edict which the Tien Wang had his son, a lad of twelve, write for them:

"I learn that the foreign teacher Griffith John, and his friend, esteeming the Kingdom of Heaven, and reverencing and believing in my Father (God) and my adopted Father (Christ) . . . have come for the express purpose of requesting permission to spread abroad the true doctrine. Seeing, however, that the present is a time of war, and that the soldiers are scattered abroad in every direction, I am afraid that the missionaries might be injured by following the rabble soldiery, and that thus serious consequences might ensue. Still I truly perceive that these (missionaries) are sincere and faithful men, and that they count it nothing to suffer with Christ, and because of this I esteem them very highly.

"Let the Kings (Wangs) inform all the officers and others that they must all act lovingly and harmoniously towards these men, and by no means engender contention and strife. . . . And let these (missionaries) be treated exceedingly well. Respect this."

Chung Wang, the best of all the Tai-ping leaders, was at Nanking at the time of this visit, and he asked Mr. John to represent his views to his associates.

"You have had the Gospel for upwards of 1,800 years. We, only, as it were, eight days. Your knowledge of it ought to be correct and extensive; ours must necessarily be limited and imperfect. You must therefore bear with us for the present, and we will gradually improve. As for the Gospel, it is one, and must be propagated throughout the world. Let the Foreign Brethren all know that we are determined to uproot idolatry, and plant Christianity in its place."[1]

The Tai-ping Rebellion is to be judged by utterances like these quite as fairly as by the trail of devastation which followed it. And so judged we can understand why some should wonder whether there was not more hope for China in it than has ever been revealed in the Manchu dynasty. It is true that the attempted change was baptized in blood, but it was through such a baptism the Manchu dynasty came to the throne, and while the loss and ruin of the rebellion were terrible, there have been other great disasters which have more than once fallen upon the empire in the past, and even under its present rulers and with no prospect at those times, of such an outcome of good as it seems not rash to hope might have issued from the inconoclasm and the earnestness of Hung Siu-tsuen and his best associates. "The rebels," wrote Dr. John to the Directors of the London Missionary Society, "are centuries ahead of the Imperialists." In their best developments, it was their very virtues that fanned the flames of hate among the ruling classes, who were themselves constantly guilty of the same vices which they denounced in Hung Siu-tsuen. The exaltation of Shang-ti above all other gods, the destruction of idols, the prohibition of ancestral and Confucian worship, above all the shattering blows which the Tai-pings struck at the adamantine changelessness of Chinese thought and institution—these and the political disorders inseparable from revolution were the real grounds of the opposition to them, superadded of course, to the sufficient ground that the rise of the Tai-pings meant the fall of existing authority.

And this was the movement which the most refreshing character of his generation, Charles Gordon, Knight-errant of Christendom, overthrew. And he was a good man and wise.[1] "I have taken the step on consideration," Gordon wrote home. "I think that any one who contributes to putting down this rebellion fulfills a humane task, and I also think tends a great deal to open China to civilization. . . . I can say that if I had not accepted the command, I believe the force would have been broken up and the rebellion gone on in its misery for years. I trust that this will not now be the case. . . . I think I am doing a good service." Perhaps Gordon was right. On his side, at any rate, is the powerful argument that the rebellion was put down, and it is profitless business disputing the sealed and irreversible past.[2] But how else can we act wisely in the future than by learning the lessons of what may possibly have been mistakes in the past? And "looking back at this distance of time," as Dr. Martin says, "with all the light of subsequent history upon the results, we are still inclined to ask whether a different policy might not have been better for China. Had foreign Powers promptly recognized the Tai-ping Chief in the outbreak of the second war, might it not have shortened a chapter of horrors that dragged on for fifteen more years, ending in the Nien-fei and Mohammedan rebellions, and causing the loss of fifty millions of human lives? Is it not probable that a new power would have shown more aptitude than the old one for the assimilation of new ideas, as in chemistry nascent elements enter into combination that are impossible for those that have long enjoyed a separate existence? In international politics it too often happens that present interests are allowed to outweigh prospective advantages. Thus it came to pass that, more than once when the Insurgents were on the verge of success, the prejudices of short sighted diplomats decided against them, and an opportunity was lost such as does not occur twice in a thousand years."[3]

---

[1] Robson, *Griffith John*, pp. 42–47.

But a similar opportunity occurred in slow moving China within less than half a century, and it, too, was thrown away, as we shall see. Perhaps if we would now learn the lessons of the Tai-ping Rebellion and of the Reform Movement of 1898, we should be ready to seize the next opportunity when it comes.

---

[1] "Of all the people I have met with in my life," wrote Professor Huxley, "he and Darwin are the two in whom I have found something bigger than ordinary humanity—an unequalled simplicity and directness of purpose—a sublime unselfishness" (Leonard Huxley, *Life and Letters of Thomas H. Huxley*, Vol. II, p. 102).

[2] Hake, *The Story of Chinese Gordon*, p. 60.

[3] Martin, *A Cycle of Cathay*, pp. 141f.

The suppression of the Tai-ping Rebellion not only destroyed a force quite favourable to Western civilization and religion, and hostile to the immobile customs of China, it also failed to make the existing dynasty one whit more tolerant of foreigners, and to realize in the slightest degree Gordon's hopes. Indeed, it may be doubted if the rebellion and its extermination did not make the Government less tolerant and more suspicious. It was conscious of no indebtedness to the West. Did not Nanking surrender to Chinese generals and was not the "Ever Victorious Army" merely a body of hirelings employed by Chinese officials? And even if there was any slight recognition of the services of Western Nations without which the rebellion would not have been suppressed, this was counterbalanced by the natural reflection that the whole uprising was due to Western influence working on an erratic Chinese mind. If Western ideas create such a ferment in men's minds ought they not to be excluded? One source of anti-foreign feeling[1] in China to-day, is to be found in the remembrance by the officials of the Tai-ping uprising and its protestation of sympathy with Western Nations and Christianity.[2]

"It is no chimera, therefore," says Mr. Alexander Michie, in one of his pungent criticisms of the missionary enterprise in China, "that the Chinese dread in Christianity, but a proved national peril, their vague intuitions of which ripened suddenly into a terrible experience. Perhaps the gravest feature in the Tai-ping outbreak, considered as an episode of Christian development, was that, although unforeseen, it was a not unnatural result of the fermentation of Hebrew theology and theocracy undiluted, in minds fretting at the hardness of the problems of life. Regarded in the light of religious history, the great Christian insurrection was not more extravagant in its combination of ferocity with fervour, than other moral hurricanes which have swept over mankind, though the unconscious blasphemy of its creed may perhaps put it in a class by itself. There is here no question as to the intrinsic merits of the Tai-ping insurrection, or the true character of its head. Whether it would have been better in the long run for the Chinese, or for the human race, that the movement should have succeeded, or whether the leader was a hero or an impostor, are speculations which have an interest of their own, but are out of place here, our concern being only with the phenomena of the rising, and with the estimate formed of it by the Chinese Government and people, who have the preeminent right to judge. The practical question is, What security have the Chinese against a repetition of this, or some other form of calamity? The depths of fanaticism have not yet been sounded, nor the possible vagaries of the human heart exhausted. Much of the same evangelizing proceedings, so far at least as the Chinese Government can be expected to distinguish, which incited the Taiping rebels, are being carried on without intermission over a vastly wider field; and the missionaries to-day know perhaps as little of the ferments which they may have set up in thousands of minds, as they did of the incubation of Tai-pingdom."[1] I have quoted these words, not to make certain obvious comments on them, but simply to indicate how it is possible that the Tai-ping Rebellion has left on the minds of the Chinese rulers, saved from the rebellion by Western influence, a feeling of great suspicion and dislike of that influence. It should be added, however, that such suspicion is of slight proportion when compared with the hatred and distrust for which China has been furnished with abundant reason in other ways.

---

[1] "At that time," says the Rev. Hunter Corbett, D. D., speaking of the condition of North China in 1860, "the whole nation was kept in a constant whirl of excitement in consequence of the Tai-ping Rebellion, which collapsed in the year 1865, after a terrible conflict of twenty years. The leaders in that rebellion were everywhere spoken of as members of the Christian Church, or propagators of the Christian faith. Wherever the rebels went temples were burned and idols destroyed. All who would not espouse their cause were put to death. In the minds of most, Christianity and rebellion with all its woes seem to have been regarded as inseparable. The people as a class seriously feared, and so far as possible avoided the teachers of Christianity" (*Twenty-five Years of Missionary Work in the Province of Shan-tung*, p. 2).

[2] Reid, *The Sources of Anti-Foreign Disturbances in China*, p. 31.

The Secret Society known as the Ko-lao-hui, which has its headquarters in Hu-nan, and was believed by some to be responsible for the riots directed against foreigners in Central China in 1891, was established by Tseng Kuo-fan, general in the imperial army, which besieged the Tai-pings in Nanking, and its organization was begun at that time. Hostile to the Manchu dynasty and at one with the Tai-pings in that hostility, though aiming at the re-establishment not of the Ming but of the T'ang dynasty, this society seems to have been conceived before the Tai-ping walls in a spirit of hostility to foreigners (Ball, *Things Chinese*, pp. 362f.).

The Rebellion was an expression of the undying hostility of the

---

[1] Michie, *China and Christianity*, pp. 45f.

Chinese people to the Tartar rule. Of course that rule is accepted, but every few years some outbreak occurs which shows the great sea of disloyalty in Chinese hearts. The Manchu dynasty has been one of the best in the long line of Chinese rulers, but the people have never been reconciled to its usurpation of the throne. Will the Western Nations never learn this, and cease to support against the Chinese people themselves, a foreign and unpopular rule,—unpopular, so far, at least, as that word is applicable in China.

There are some other lessons to be gathered from this dramatic chapter of history, which we should recall before we leave it. One is that the Chinese people are not the phlegmatic, immobile people we have too often supposed. It has been said that Christianity can never make any great impression on the nation, and that what is done will be merely the superficial change of individuals here and there; Chinese character and the Chinese race are too permanent to be altered. The Tai-ping uprising teaches precisely the reverse. A mighty movement swept north and east, and dominated the richest section of the Empire. It is true that multitudes did not follow it, or followed it passively, desiring only to be unmolested by whatever dynasty sat on the throne. But, on the other hand, tens of thousands followed Hung Siu-tsuen, who sang his hymns and joined in his prayers and washed their breasts with his baptism. It was an uprising not in the most phlegmatic and stationary nation, but among the race of all races, excitable, restless, revolutionary. We do not need to attempt to solve the paradox of Chinese character, and to understand how the same people can be excitable, restless, revolutionary, and at the same time stolid, passive, content. It is enough to remember that it is so, and that Chinese history teaches nothing more emphatically than the possibility of mighty national movement and of radical change. The race is one race. It is not a multitude of peoples like India. It is swayed by common impulses, bound in one vast solidarity, and awaiting the touch of one Lord and the life of one Salvation.

The figure of Chinese Gordon standing out above all the other characters in the suppression of the movement, teaches—alas! that it should be a lesson which those who need it most will not receive—how a representative of Christendom should bear himself in official position in an Eastern land. Christianity suffered no reproach at

Gordon's hand. He lifted in the eyes of the Chinese the Christianity he professed, and the nations he represented. Refusing money, keeping promises inviolate, scorning the duplicity, as he deemed it, of Li Hung Chang,—whose great career the Tai-ping Rebellion began, by offering him his first opportunity for great public service,—dealing justly, walking humbly before his God, and loving mercy, Gordon won the affection of many and commanded the confidence of all. His personal body-guard towards the close of the war was made up of Tai-ping soldiers who had surrendered to him, and in whose power he constantly placed himself. And one of the Tai-ping chiefs said that he had often seen his soldiers strike up a gun levelled at Gordon when he had chanced to expose himself. "This has been the act of a chief," he said, "yea, of the Shield King himself. How then can we be accused of blind hatred to our enemies?" When Gordon had laid down his work, the British Minister at Peking, wrote home to Earl Russell, that "His disinterestedness has elevated our national character in the eyes of the Chinese. Not only has he refused any pecuniary reward, but he has spent more than his pay in contributing to the comfort of the soldiers who served under him, and in assuaging the distress of the starving population whom he relieved from the yoke of their oppressors." By an untarnished life, by unwearied devotion to duty, by kindness and considerateness, by stern justice and a tender heart, by uncompromising loyalty to the Master he served, Charles Gorden set an example which would revolutionize missionary work in Asia if it were imitated by all who go out from the West to the East, to serve governments or to follow trade.

Once again, the Tai-ping Rebellion demonstrated in that spectacular way which seems to be necessary to impress the Western imagination, the hopelessness and helplessness of China. Without impulse and influence from without the great empire in whose sickness or health are wrapped up the interests of one-fourth of the human race can bring forth no good and hopeful reform. The Confucian element in the Tai-ping system was worthy and restraining but, for the rest, what there was of good, of free progress, of righteousness in the movement of the Tai-pings, was imported from without. The cruelty, the mis-government, the buffoonery were Chinese.

And the Tai-ping Rebellion was not the only evidence of unrest, of protest. China was seething in discontent at the time, and if to-day there is less rebellion, it is not because the government has reformed and improved. There is still the same need of cleansing, of utter destruction of much that cannot be cleansed. But the Tai-ping method is always a perilous method of political or social progress. That it might have succeeded many dare to believe, and it may yet prove to be the only possible course. In that day, if it comes, it may be hoped that Western Powers will be wise to discern their duty. But this is not a course which the West can pursue in assisting China to purify herself. She may not deal in the methods of revolution. She has done so enough—driven the dynasty by force to yield to this or that demand, and prevented the Chinese people from doing the same. Our political course with China may not be the revolutionary one. "What I think," said Gordon in 1864, of the right course for Western Nations to pursue, "is this, that if we try to drive the Chinese into sudden reforms, they will strike and resist with the greatest obstinacy, and will relapse back again into old habits, when the pressure is removed; but if we lead them, we shall find them willing to a degree and more easy to manage. They like to have an option and hate having a course struck out for them as if they were of no account in the matter. They also like to see the utility of the course proposed, and to have the reasons for the same explained over and over again; and they are also quick in seeing advantages and disadvantages."[1]

And if the policy of political revolution is dangerous when directed towards political ends, it is even more dangerous when religious elements are introduced into its methods and religious changes contemplated among its ends. Spiritual religion is apt to suffer under such conditions. The missionary enterprise has little to gain and a great deal to lose from the confusion of spiritual religion and political administration, whether in a movement like the Tai-ping Insurrection, where for the most part religion degenerated and political authority also, or in the missionary movement itself, where the missionaries sacrifice for some apparent but temporary good their most enduring and potent influence, when they confuse their directly spiritual and personal mission with social and political elements. It is an interesting fact that the missionaries who most frequently make this mistake themselves, were the cause, in a sense, of the failure of the rebellion. "In 1860," says Dr. Martin, "when Peking was taken by the Allies, the rebels still held many strong positions in the valley of the Yang-tse. The Emperor having fled to Tartary, Lord Elgin thought seriously of opening negotiations with the insurgent chief, but was deterred by the opposition of Baron Gros, who, adopting the views of Roman Catholic missionaries, disliked the insurgents because their religion was reported to be of a Protestant type, and because being inconoclastic, they had not taken care to distinguish between Christian images and pagan idols." [1]

---

[1] Hake, *The Story of Chinese Gordon*, p. 199.

The Tai-ping movement is a fairly conclusive answer to those who think that the time has come to withdraw the missionaries from India and China and Japan, and leave the entire burden of responsibility upon the native Church. It is probably true that the missionary movement has not laid upon the shoulders of the native Church and the native Christians of the various lands to which it has gone, enough responsibility, or laid it there early enough; but it is equally true that now and for a long time to come the Christian Church in these lands will need the friendly help and guidance of the older Churches. And in the matter of the Tai-pings, there is truth in the view to which Mr. Michie objects when he says, "the political aims and deplorable excesses of the rebels were attributed to, if not excused by, the absence of personal instruction by foreign missionaries, —a wholly insufficient account of the matter." [2] Yes, it is an insufficient account of the matter. Missionary instruction might not have been heeded, was never truly asked, and in the case of Mr. Roberts, was not utilized even after having been apparently solicited. At this time the Tai-ping Rebellion had grown beyond any such guidance or restraint. But the fact remains that missionaries would most assuredly have given it a different direction, although they may have had much sympathy with it as a revolution which had taken its own course, and which could scarcely issue in a condition worse politically than that which already prevailed in China and seemed likely to continue. And the course which Hung Siu-tsuen worked out for himself, the distorted theology he developed, the heresies he adopted, the errors into which he fell, indicate that it is not enough for us just to throw out at random into a country like China, the immense and revolutionary forces of the Gospel, and let them take their own development.

---

[1] Martin, *A Cycle of Cathay*, p. 140f.

[2] Michie, *China and Christianity*, p. 45.

One other lesson remains to be pressed, and one of the saddest of all. Whatever the remoter influences of the Uprising, its immediate result was the annihilation of idolatry in the territory which the Tai-pings had subdued. "When the earthquake of the Rebellion was over," says Archdeacon Moule, "conspicuous among the ruins were to be seen—as I saw with my own eyes—'the idols utterly abolished' by Chinese hands. The temples were burnt and thrown down, and not a whole image was to be seen in city or country for hundreds of miles. No tongue was raised in defence of idolatry and in praise of idols; and it was admitted with a sad smile of perplexity and despair, that gods which could not keep their own heads on their shoulders could not be expected to preserve their worshippers from murder and rapine."[1] It is doubtful whether in all her history another such opportunity as this has been presented to the Christian Church. She might have gone in and set up Christian worship on the site of every dismantled temple, and preached the Gospel from the pedestal of every discredited god. As two native evangelists from Hang-chow said to an English missionary in Ningpo, when the Tai-pings had gone, "After all its sufferings surely there must be repentance. Strike the iron, sir, while it is hot."[2] It was the day of all days for the evangelization of China. God seemed to stay the sun in the heavens to prolong it, but it passed at last. The shadows fell again across the land, and in the dark the temples rose and once more the idols came back and looked down upon their worshippers, and the Christian Church, barring here and there some eager soul that felt the anguish of it all, slept content, not knowing what the day was that had gone. And perhaps here and there, too, some sincere follower of Hung Siu-tsuen, surviving the ferocity of the storm, looked on the new temples and their gods, recalled some prayer he had learned in the Tai-ping camps, and wondered where the truth was to be found.

---

[1] *The Glorious Land*, p. 25.

[2] Stock, *History of the Church Missionary Society*, Vol. II, p. 582.

Supplement to Chapter I

The Tai-ping Rebellion

Dr. Legge's Letter to the London Missionary Society

"HONGKONG, *July 11th, 1862.*

"DEAR BROTHER:—I was much grieved to hear that our own government has approved in Parliament of Admiral Hope's proceedings, and still more to read in various newspapers, accounts all on one side, about the rebels, intended to justify the most violent and vigorous proceedings against them. I wish by this opportunity to offer to you some dispassionate observations on the course of action recommended, and I shall not be sorry if you think it advisable to give them a greater publicity.

"I do not take this matter in hand as an apologist for the religious views and political course of the Tai-pings. It is assumed by many that missionaries have been and still are their advocates in spite of the plain witness of undeniable and melancholy facts. I do not wonder that some should do so; they are under the influence of a foregone conclusion—the result of ignorance, I will suppose, rather than of malice—namely, that missionaries as a class are weak and ignorant men, with a tendency to fanaticism.

"*Former Opinions of Missionaries in Reference to the Tai-pings Favourable but Qualified.*

"The utmost that can be alleged against missionaries is, that when the rebel movement first came prominently before the world, in 1853, after the capture of Nanking, many of them hailed the religious sentiments expressed in the tracts and manifestos of their leaders, much wondering whereunto they would grow, and hoping as they wondered. When they knew that portions of the Word of God were printed and circulated without note or comment, they rejoiced exceedingly—and strange it would have been if they had not done so; but when, in the course of time, the blossom of promise connected with the movement began to wither and die, their regret was corresponding to the hopeful interest which they had previously cherished; and as they had opportunity, they remonstrated with the Tai-pings themselves, nor did they hide anything which they knew from the public. As I carefully send my thoughts back over the last nine years, I can single out from amongst the missionary body in China, but one solitary eccentric exception to the statement just given.

"Perhaps you will allow me to refer to some letters from my own pen which were published with reference to the rebels. The earliest of which I have a copy, was written January, 1854, and appeared in the *Evangelical Magazine* for

April of that year; it was composed when wonder and hope predominated, yet I then said, 'I do not wish to be understood as prepared to give any opinion as to the extent to which these people appreciate and are influenced by the holy and spiritual principles of our religion. All these things are elements out of which much error and confusion may grow, and, knowing their existence, we cannot but fear lest the religion of the masses become a fanaticism rather than the intelligent faith of the Gospel which we should delight to recognize.' In July of the same year, I wrote again thus, 'Two points seem to be established; first, that the religion of the insurgents is running into a wild and blasphemous fanaticism; and second, that they have assumed an attitude of determined hostility to foreigners. From the first, I professed my disbelief in the revelations to which Hung Siu-tsuen, their chief, laid claim, and my horror of his asserting a peculiar brotherhood with our Lord. Objective truths from any other sources but the Bible are to be traced to madness, delusion or imposture. This development of error is throwing the truth, which attracted us at first and filled us with hope, into the shade. And as the truth perishes from the minds of the insurgents, so will their power pass away. The iron rod will change into a reed.'

"*Deterioration in the Character of Hung Jin, the Kan Wang.*

"From that time, I felt but little interest in the Tai-pings, till I discovered, about two years ago, that my old friend Hung Jin was among them—the 'Shield King,' the special favourite and counsellor of Hung Siu-tsuen. I did hope that he would be able to correct many of their errors, guiding them to correct views of religious truth and to prudent courses of political action; and the first proclamations from him, and a long memorial to the 'Celestial King,' did not disappoint me. Soon, however, the news of his polygamy dashed my reviving hopes. I wrote several letters to him, but ceased to expect that he would work any deliverance in China. I have said, in one of the letters referred to, that the insurgents had developed a determined hostility to foreigners. Hung Jin was prepared to counsel them wisely on this point, and he did so. Had we been willing to enter into negotiations with them in 1860, or even last year, we should have found that their calling us 'foreign brethren' had a real, good, substantial meaning in it. Still the 'Shield King' was not equal to the difficulties of his position. He has not been guilty of many charges alleged against him, but there is reason to fear that he has made shipwreck of faith and of a good conscience.

"*No Just Cause for British Hostilities Against the Tai-pings.*

"It is time that I should come to what I undertook—to the subject of our entering into hostilities with the Tai-pings. What casus belli have they given us? Possibly there may be a sufficient one stated in some despatch that the Government at home received, and which has been laid before Parliament. Mr. Bruce had some communication with them, and subsequently Admiral Hope paid a visit to them at Nanking. But it is possible, also, that our present difficulties have arisen as much from the unreasonableness of our own countrymen as from that of the insurgents. The Kings are 'Coolies' it is true, or, rather, they were Coolies; intercourse with them is different from intercourse with the barbaric pomp and tawdry shame of the Imperial Court. They profess many absurd and fanatical dogmas; their views as to theology are miserably degrading on those subjects which to us are high and sacred. Their warfare against the Imperialists leads to indescribable misery among the people. All these things are true; but I fail to discover in them anything like a casus belli, as regards ourselves. Had the rebels outraged British property and then refused to give satisfaction? Had they entered into engagements with us, and then willfully and knowingly violated them? Did they threaten to stop our trade, or had they instituted any measures for that purpose? I have not heard any of the things involved in these questions alleged against the Tai-pings. It seems to me that we have heedlessly made war upon them. I contend that after holding the second city of the empire for nine years, and come forth victorious from five hundred conflicts with the Imperial forces, they ought to have been respected by us as belligerents. We had only to preserve a policy of neutrality, aiding neither them nor the Imperialists in their protracted struggle, and the Tai-pings would not have molested us. It is vehemently asserted that the foreign settlement would not have been safe with Shanghai in the hands of the rebels. Such an assertion can only be met by another equally vehement on the opposite side. But I fully agree with many who hold that if we, on our side, had clearly professed our neutrality, and fully explained our views to the rebels, they would have kept aloof from every place where foreigners were located by treaty right.

"*Deplorable Consequences of the Conflict.*

"But it avails not to implore the fact that we have taken the field against the Tai-pings, or to deplore it the more as needless and unjustifiable; it is a fact. We have defeated the enemy in every engagement, losing also valuable lives on our own side. But Admiral Hope undertook more than the forces available were equal to. We were obliged to retire and concentrate our troops in and around Shanghai. We handed over our conquests to the Imperialists, and when we had retired down came the Tai-pings and made short work of the 'braves.' The poor people are now in harder case than they had been before. They have been driven by thousands into Shanghai. There are they nearly houseless and half fed. Cholera finds them an easy prey. More than 900 died last month within three days. These, it may be said, are unavoidable miseries of war. But the war is a fact, and it must be prosecuted. The British Government has approved Admiral Hope's measures. A large army must be concentrated again in China. Ten thousand allies—French and English—must be in the Yang-tse to annihilate the rebellion and give peace to the empire!

"*Difficulties in the Present Position and Future Proceedings of the British Government.*

"It behooves the British Parliament—the British people—to look at this new complication of affairs in China, to look it fairly in the face. If we are to pacify the empire, we shall require 50,000 troops, and may then find again that we have undertaken more than we are equal to. But I ask in whose interest we are to put down the rebellion. Hitherto, Admiral Hope has been acting in the interest of the Imperial Government. Of course, if we fight its battles, it must pay all expenses. The British people cannot be expected to sacrifice the lives of its sons, and its treasure, to establish the Manchu rule, and all gratuitously. Now I protest against our putting down the rebellion on behalf of the Imperial Government, however that may pay for it, on two grounds. The first is the ground of its cruelty. I have harrowing accounts of the devastations of the rebels—how the country is blasted by their march. The accounts are no doubt true. But I have seen all the ways of the Imperial braves, and kept company with them for hours together. Their march over the country was like the progress of locusts and caterpillars. Their thirst for blood was quenchless; their outrages on the young and old were indescribable. On the score of cruelty the case must be about even, inclining to the imperialist side, if we may judge on the principle that the more cowardly are the more cruel. But the question is not about the masses, but about the officers of the Government. And to know what will be the consequence if we put down the rebels in behalf of the Imperial Government, we have only to think of Yeh and his doings in Canton, when in almost twelve months he beheaded 70,000. I have heard Sir John Bowring, when other arguments for the Arrow War were exhausted, enlarge graphically on Yeh's barbarities. If we put down the Tai-pings, we shall kill our thousands on the battlefield and the governors of provinces will kill their tens of thousands in the execution areas. We shall be installing so many Yehs. Our high officers will be the ministers to so many butchers of human beings.

" *Weakness and Cruelty of the Imperialists.*

"The second ground on which I object to the putting down of the rebellion on the behalf of the Imperial Government is the utter deficiency of that government. Apart from rebel districts, the people everywhere set it at defiance. It is unable to fulfill its treaty engagements. Its soldiers are often uncivil and rude; the gentry are everywhere sullen and insolent; the mob is often riotous and violent; but against soldiers, gentry, and the mob, the authorities can hardly give any protection. Treaties stipulate for the toleration of the Chinese Christians, and for liberty to missionaries to preach and teach and to build chapels. Chinese Christians are often spoiled; the native missionary is stoned and murdered, his chapels are plundered and profaned, and government does nothing. The Government at Peking sends out a magniloquent edict; the provincial government issues letters and proclamations. Each is powerless. Christian blood is spilt, Christian property is plundered, Christian progress is stopped. All this under the government for which we are to spend our money and pour out the blood of our soldiers! This must not be.

"I dare say those who advocate the carrying out of Admiral Hope's initiatory measures, and the carrying on war against the rebels on a great scale, would tell us that they don't mean to do so on behalf of the Imperial Government without insisting on securities from that Government that it will fulfill all its treaty stipulations, and securing from it also greater privileges. This is to me a vain dream. The Israelites had an easier task to make bricks without straw than we are setting ourselves in undertaking to pacify China in harmony with the Manchu Government. The Manchus have had their time in China as the Stuarts in Britain, and the Bourbons in France. It is not ours to hasten their downfall by interfering against them in the struggle between them and the Tai-pings, but neither are they worthy that we should interfere in their behalf. And whereas it is affirmed that we interfere in behalf of our own commerce, it has not been shown that the rebels ever tried to check our commerce. Our green tea and our silk have come for eighteen months from districts in their hands. Where they are, it is said, all is desolation; but where the Imperial authority exists there you have the people. True; because we have not been in any place where their possession of the country was uncontested. In no country where war is raging can we expect to find a crowded and industrious population. I have tried, and tried in vain, to find some grounds on which I could justify in my own mind our commencement of active hostilities with the Tai-pings. There was one fair course for us to pursue—a real impartial neutrality. We have departed from it without good reason, and launched upon a stormy sea not knowing clearly whither we are bound, and not prepared for what may befall us.

" *Neutrality the only Safe and Righteous Course for Our Government.*

"It is vain, I suppose, to hope that there will be an honest return to a policy of neutrality. We cannot help, it will be said, following up the course which Admiral Hope has initiated. But the British Parliament should lay down certain limits which neither ambition nor caprice on the part of conductors of affairs here may overpass. Let the severity of our dealings with the Tai-pings be tempered with mercy; it should not be ours to coöperate in their extermination. If we subdue them so as to place them at the mercy of the Government, we should insist on it and see to it that its dealings be also tempered with mercy. We should see to it also that the privileges which we have fought for and won, which are now treaty rights, actually take effect. While I thus write, I confess that I think we shall find a conflict with the Tai-pings a very painful, tedious and expensive affair; and that the attempt to bolster up the Manchu dynasty will be found a very thankless and uncertain undertaking. Let it be granted that we can put the rebellion down, and that the present boy Emperor comes in our time to take the reins of government in his own hand—after all what shall we have done for the millions of Chinese people? The French and we together may support a Tartar Emperor in Peking, as the French maintain the Pope in Rome, and the Chinese may not be a bit more grateful to us than the people of the States of the Church are to Louis Napoleon.

"I will venture to say that at this crisis in Chinese history, the hope of the Emperor lay in one of two things—a native revolution, or a foreign occupancy. For hundreds of years since the Christian era there have been in China anarchy and strife. The nation has groaned in pain for centuries, until at last the ruler, to bind up its distracted state, has appeared. If foreigners stood aloof, some man equal to the difficulties of the position might in our time come forth, and a new dynasty might be inaugurated, under which the millions would enjoy repose. At present the French and ourselves are in arms together; the French, whose avowed object is to defend the claim of Popery; and we, whose avowed object is to defend and extend our commerce, and whose representatives, some of them, at least, are annoyed by the presence and operations of Protestant missionaries.

"Our policy should be to abstain from interferences in the internal business of the empire. If the government de facto accepts of foreign aid in the management of its customs, that is well. If it encourages foreigners to enter its service in other departments, that is well. But let not us call those rebels whom it calls rebels. Let not us lend our armies and fleets to do for it what it cannot do for itself. If we only did what was right, China would, by and by, in God's providence, come to a better state than it is in at present. Whatever betide, a nation is no more justifiable than an individual, in doing evil that good may come.

"I have written much more than I intended; you will, however, take the trouble to read my remarks as they stand. Information on the state of things in China is sadly wanted at home. You may think the whole or a portion of what I have said not unworthy to be given to the public.

"I remain,

"Yours very sincerely,

"(signed) JAMES LEGGE.[1]

"*Rev. Dr. Tidman.*"

---

[1] *The Missionary Magazine*, October, 1862, pp. 283–288.

The Indian Mutiny

II

THE INDIAN MUTINY

"WITHOUT wishing to appear as the advocate of the East India Company, for we are free to admit that many errors have existed and some still exist, and we intend in another place remarking upon these, yet we feel that truth requires us to say, notwithstanding all these, the government has been a great blessing to the people, and of late years has been steadily gaining moral strength, and advancing rapidly in the estimation of such as know her best, and are able to appreciate improvements and right government."[1] Those are the words of the sole surviving member of the Fatehgarh Mission Station, all of whose associates were shot down by Nana Sahib on the parade ground at Cawnpore, on the morning of June 10, 1857, in one of the bloody massacres of the Indian Mutiny. It was an uprising of the Sepoy troops against the East India Company, but it was more than this. It was an incipient revolt of a great body of the Indian people against the British Power and the whole movement of civilization, enlightenment and uprightness for which it stood, and Americans and missionaries shared the sufferings which followed the merciless fury of the assault upon the authority and the existence of the great organization which had spread over the whole of India from Calcutta to Peshawar, and from the Himalayas to Ceylon.

The East India Company was incorporated under charter from Queen Elizabeth on the last day of December, 1600. Other companies organized to compete with it were one by one absorbed. Under Clive it overthrew the influence of the French, and by the victory of Wandiwash under Colonel Coote, in 1760, "left not a single ensign of the French nation avowed by the authority of its Government in any part of India." By the battle of Plassey in 1757, Clive extended the authority of the Company into Bengal, Madras having been its seat of operations, and gathered as spoils from the campaign about eight million dollars for the Company; Clive himself claiming 280,000 rupees as member of the select committee, in addition to 200,000 rupees as commander-in-chief, and 1,600,000 rupees as a "private donation." Clive also secured for the Company an extensive land grant around Calcutta, the land tax of which, however, for a term of years he obtained for himself from the Mogul Emperor at Delhi, the nominal suzerain of the Nawab of Bengal. This annual rent of 222,958 rupees was paid to Clive from 1765 until his death in 1774. During the four or five years Clive was in England prior to his return as Governor for the second time in 1765, the tradition of plunder which had been established was maintained. The puppet Nawab of Bengal, set up by the British in 1757, was dethroned, and the occasion utilized to obtain further generous private donations and a grant of three districts estimated to yield a net revenue of half a million sterling a year. Upon Clive's return, two principles of action were adopted—"First, he sought the substance although not the name of territorial power, under the fiction of a grant from the Mogul Emperor. Second, he desired to purify the Company's service, by prohibiting illicit gains, and guaranteeing a reasonable salary from honest sources."[1]

---

[1] Walsh, *The Martyred Missionaries*, p. 125.

The territorial authority of the Company was extended from year to year. Under Hastings the administration of the immense and growing responsibilities of the Company was solidified. He "reorganized the Indian service, reformed every branch of the revenue collections, created courts of justice, and laid the basis of a police," while he struck out a bold and authoritative policy in dealing with the Native States.

It is not necessary, however, to trace in detail the development of British dominion in India under the East India Company. Enough has been already said to indicate its main characteristics. It was determined upon supremacy. The idea of actual empire over the country developed very slowly, but the purpose to control it arose early and was never lost sight of. The Company, moreover, so far as its representatives in India were concerned, was usually able to surmount any inconvenient obstacles imposed by the standards of morality and justice in the West, and to deal with the corrupt governments of India on their own ground. We can understand the ease with which this was done if we recall that our present standards of morality and justice did not then govern Western States in their conduct at home. Probably the East India Company's agents were doing what the public opinion of the civilized world at that time did not greatly reprobate. Once again, the Company established order and a measure of justice wherever its influence extended. It was to the interest of trade that there should be tranquillity, and while the Company was ever ready to fight for money, or for peace for money's sake, it desired the country to be still and strove to adjust the perpetual strife of the Native States, save where this strife could be made of advantage to the Company's interests.

---

[1] Hunter, *Brief History of the Indian Peoples*, p. 185.

As public opinion rose at home, and the British people came to feel in some measure the burden of a sense of responsibility for India, the character of the Company's administration improved. It had under its control an increasing proportion of the population of India, and it had an increasing authority over this proportion. Hastings himself had introduced the spirit of reform. Under Lord William Bentinck, governor-general from 1828 to 1835, a new sense of duty was born. As Macaulay wrote, for the inscription upon Bentinck's statue in Calcutta, "he abolished cruel rites; he effaced humiliating distinctions; he gave liberty to the expression of public opinion; his constant study was to elevate the intellectual and moral character of the nations committed to his charge." Among his many reforms were the abolition of suttee or widow burning and the suppression of the thugs, or wandering assassins, fifteen hundred of whom were captured during his governorship. In the main, the ideals established by Lord William Bentinck have governed British rule in India ever since.

But it must be kept in mind that the reason for the existence of the East India Company was trade. It fought to extend and secure its trade. It tried to govern well from a sense of duty, but chiefly for the sake of the financial profit of it, or for the perpetuation of control. When the Company in 1689 determined to build up its power in India by acquiring territory, its resolution for the guidance of its servants in India read: "The increase of our revenue is the subject of our care, as much as our trade; 'tis that must maintain our force when twenty accidents may interrupt our trade; 'tis that must make us a nation in India." The immediate aim of the Company was money.[1] "The object of the Company was to pay good dividends."[2] As has been said, worthier ideals later were added to this, but as late as 1853 the Earl of Ellenborough, formerly a governor-general, and a typical East India Company man, asked Sir Charles Trevelyan, in a parliamentary inquiry, whether he thought "that a separate (*i. e.*, independent, responsible) Government established in India would pay the dividends upon the East Indian stock or the pensions due to the civil and military servants?" The object of the Company was not primarily the good of the people of India. As we shall see, it opposed measures designed for their good under the fear that trade might be injured. It resisted the entrance of missionaries with bitterness;[3] but its aims and methods did not prevent or seek to prevent such a condition as Sir Charles Trevelyan described in his testimony before a Parliamentary Committee: "'Direct appointments' to Company's army in India, as they are called, that is appointments which enable young men to be sent out direct to India without any check except that of passing a slight examination, are much sought after as a convenient mode of providing for young men, who, owing either to misconduct or incompetency, are unfit for English professions. In other words, although the great majority of the Cadets are well conducted and honorable young men, India is a sink towards which the scum and refuse of the English professions habitually gravitates."[1]

---

[1] Monier Williams, *Modern India and the Indians*, p. 274.

[2] Malleson, *The Indian Mutiny*, p. 1.

[3] At the beginning the attitude of the East India Company had been quite different. Streynsham Masters, who was governor of Madras in 1678–1682 is described as having "strenuously endeavoured to instill a sense and remembrance of the true religion in the rising settlement committed to his charge." The "charter of 1698—applied to the United East India Company in 1708—contained provisions for a missionary and an educational as well as an ecclesiastical establishment. A schoolmaster and minister were to be maintained in every garrison and central factory to learn both Portuguese and the local vernacular, 'the better to enable them to instruct the Gentoos in the Protestant religion.' Soon after this the directors ordered the use of 'a form of prayer, beseeching God that these Indian nations, amongst whom we dwell, seeing our sober and righteous conversation, may be induced to have a great esteem for our most holy profession of the Gospel.'" But the character of the Company in this regard greatly changed. The Company had become at the close of the eighteenth century "the most intolerant enemy of Christian missions. Charles Grant wrote his treatise in 1792 to influence the new Charter then under discussion. In spite of all his efforts and those of Wilberforce in the Commons, his brother directors and proprietors caused Parliament to refuse to insert even this vague moral or 'pious' clause, as it was called, in the Charter of 1793: 'That it is the peculiar and bounden duty of the British Legislature to promote, by all just and prudent means, the interest and happiness of the inhabitants of the British dominions in India; and that for these ends such measures ought to be adopted as may gradually tend to their advancement in useful knowledge, and to their religious and moral comfort.' This was not even formally adopted till the Charter of 1813, and not really carried out till that of 1833" (Smith, *Short History of Christian Missions*, pp. 141, 144f.).

The day came, however, when the East India Company ceased to be a trading company in any sense at all. Originally it was a trading company exclusively. The regulating Act of 1773, passed by the ministry of Lord North, to whom America is unhappily indebted, gave the Company its political powers, and defined the Constitution of the Indian government. The India bill of 1784 founded the Board of Control in England. In 1813 when the charter was renewed, the Company's monopoly of Indian trade was taken away, and it was ordered "to direct its energies to the good government of the people." In 1833 the charter was again renewed for twenty years, on condition that the Company should abandon its trade entirely both with India and China, and permit Europeans to settle freely in India. In 1853 the charter was once more renewed, but with no specification of time. The Company's powers were further curtailed, and it stood, as it were, on its good behaviour. The governor-general in whose term this last renewal fell, and whose administration was to be immediately followed by the upheaval which would annihilate the Company, was the Earl of Dalhousie, the greatest of all the Indian governors. He annexed the Punjab and Burmah after the second Sikh and Burmese Wars. He began the great system of roads and canals which now covers India. The Ganges Canal was opened by him, and he broke the sod of the first railway. He established cheap postage and the telegraph, and above all, he was a high-minded, earnest man, loving peace and desiring the good of the people. The last act of his administration was the completion of the fabric of British rule in India by the annexation of Oudh, declaring that "the British Government would be guilty in the sight of God and man if it were any longer to aid in sustaining by its countenance an administration fraught with suffering to millions." He handed over the government to his friend Lord Canning, whose farewell words to the Court of Directors in England, were, "I wish for a peaceful term of office. But I cannot forget that in the sky of India serene as it is, a small cloud may arise, no larger than a man's hand, but which growing larger and larger, may at last threaten to burst and overwhelm us with ruin."[1] Within twelve months the cloud had burst, and the storm swept the valley of the upper Ganges with death and desolation.

---

[1] *Minutes of the Evidence taken before the Select Committee on Indian Territories, 1853*, p. 219.

Although there were many preceding mutterings which the authorities either ignored or discredited, the storm did not break in real fury until May 10, 1857, when the Sepoys at Meerut mutinied and streamed off to Delhi, where the native troops the next day rose in rebellion. Delhi was the old capital city of the Mogul dynasty, and the discrowned old Emperor was living there. Its possession by the rebels thus gave to the Mutiny a rallying centre, and an immense prestige. John Lawrence and Lord Canning at once perceived this, and the capture of Delhi became, with the relief of Cawnpore and Lucknow, the great objective of the campaign. At Cawnpore four hundred and fifty Europeans, chiefly women and children, after holding out against Nana Sahib and the mutineers from the 6th to the 27th of June, shut up in entrenchments under a terrible heat, surrendered under the Nana's pledge of safe conduct to Allahabad. As soon, however, as they had embarked on the Ganges, they were fired upon and the whole company, save four men who escaped, perished, either at the time, or a fortnight later, when the relief of "Havelock's Saints" was almost at hand.[2] Lucknow had the immense advantage of the presence of Henry Lawrence, the Chief Commissioner of Oudh, and under his guidance and inspiration held out until relief came. Delhi was captured on September 20th, and after eighteen months' fighting, Oudh and Central India, where the revolt was a popular uprising, were subdued. Apart from the general horror and disorder caused by the Mutiny, eight hundred Europeans were killed at Cawnpore alone. In various massacres at Delhi, Cawnpore and Sialkote a score of missionaries lost their lives.

At the outset of the Mutiny Alexander Duff wrote from Calcutta, that in the evident blindness of the mutineers, their want of single,

[1] Hunter, *Brief History of the Indian Peoples*, p. 220.

[2] McCarthy, *A History of Our Own Times*, Vol. II, ch. xxxiv.

intelligent direction, the British were likely to find safety. The folly of the rebels in remaining at Delhi, instead of rushing on to Agra, Cawnpore, Allahabad, Benares and Calcutta, sweeping the Europeans into the sea, he could only attribute to the intervention of God. On June 3d, 1857, he wrote, "Thus has He saved British India in a way that pours contempt on the boasted skill, foresight and prowess of our statesmen and warriors, in such a way as to constrain all God-fearing people to exclaim, 'It is the doing of the Lord, and it is wondrous in our eyes.'"[1] When the Mutiny was over, men like John Lawrence and Montgomery could find no other explanation of British victory than Duff's. "It was not policy," wrote Montgomery, "or soldiers or officers, that saved the Indian Empire to England, and saved England to India. The Lord our God, He it was."[2]

If God was thus responsible for the termination of the Indian rebellion, wherein was man responsible for its origin?

First of all, this rebellion was the Sepoy Mutiny. The Sepoys were the native troops in the employ of the East India Company, and naturally as armed and trained soldiers, they would take the lead in any popular uprising with which they sympathized. But there have been many who would not speak of the Indian Mutiny as a popular movement at all, but only as a purely military uprising. We shall see in a moment the erroneousness of this view. But the army undoubtedly had grievances, real or supposed, of its own; and its conditions were so distinct from those of the people generally as to provide some ground for declaring that in essence the uprising was just a rebellion of the Sepoys. Among the elements which entered into the question, so far as the native army was concerned, were the following: "The belief of the natives," says Lord Roberts, "in the invincibility of the British soldiers had been seriously weakened by the lamentable occurrences at Kabul during the first Afghan War, terminating in the disastrous retreat in the winter of 1841–42. To add to the exalted idea the Sepoys were beginning to entertain of their own importance, they were pampered by their officers and the civil government to a most absurd extent, being treated under all circumstances with far greater consideration than the European soldiers. For instance, in the time of Lord William Bentinck, flogging was abolished in the native army (reintroduced, however, in 1845) while still in full swing amongst British soldiers, and Sepoys were actually allowed to witness the humiliation of their white comrades when this degrading form of punishment was inflicted upon them." At the time of the Mutiny, moreover, the native troops far outnumbered the British force. The present rule in India is to keep the British at one-third the number of the native, but when the Mutiny broke out the whole effective British force in India only amounted to 36,000 men, against 257,000 native soldiers; "a fact," says Lord Roberts, "which was not likely to be overlooked by those who hoped and strived to gain to their own side this preponderance of numerical strength, and which was calculated to inflate the minds of the Sepoys with a most undesirable sense of independence." The great extension of British dominion in India, under Lord Dalhousie, also withdrew from the Bengal army a large number of officers needed for the administration of the new territories, and these were the younger and more ambitious officers, leaving in the regiments older and less energetic men. Furthermore, at this time there was a good deal of unrest and feeling of grievance because of the increased liability of the Sepoys to employment in distant parts of India or even across the sea. The Sepoy disliked going too far from home, to reside among strangers of different religions and customs, although in war he conquered this dislike in prospect of extra pay, free rations and loot. But service across the sea in Burmah, for example, involved loss of caste, and to the Hindu Sepoys was especially distasteful. So great were their objections to this foreign service that the Company's Court of Directors sanctioned Canning's proposal that after September 1, 1856, "no native recruit shall be accepted who does not at the time of his enlistment undertake to serve beyond the sea, whether within the territories of the Company, or beyond them." "This order," adds Lord Roberts, "though absolutely unnecessary, caused the greatest dissatisfaction amongst the Hindustani Sepoys, who looked upon it as one of the measures introduced by the Sirkar for the forcible, or rather fraudulent conversion of all the natives to Christianity." It has been alleged that one reason for this order was Lord Canning's desire to have troops to send to China to take part in the Arrow War, and it has been supposed, though not with entire justice, that in this way the opium trade distinctly led to the

---

[1] Duff, *The Indian Rebellion*, p. 15.

[2] Atchinson, *Rulers of India: Lord Lawrence*, p. 114.

Mutiny.[1] It is undoubtedly true, however, as Sir Henry Havelock is said to have pointed out to Canning, that this order did lead to an increase of the disaffection which issued in the Mutiny.[2]

The "greased cartridges" and that which they were believed to signify, constituted the match for which this powder magazine of discontent and unrest in the native army had been prepared. These cartridges were manufactured at Calcutta, and native workmen knew the whole process, and were aware of the use of cow's fat and lard in preparing them. Who made the stupendous blunder of ignoring in this way the prejudices of the people, history mercifully conceals. The Mohammedan soldiers abhorred the pig as unclean, and the Hindus deemed the cow sacred. No more successful way of offending their religious convictions could have been devised. The privates and native officers of the native army, excluding the irregular cavalry, were taken entirely from the cultivating class, as Trevelyan testified to the Parliamentary Committee,[3] and while one class is scarcely less fanatical than another in India, these ignorant, bigoted villagers were the very ones to be carried away with fury in the hands of designing and clever men who knew how to manipulate them, and to utilize for their own purposes the cartridge incident. It need hardly be added that the cartridges were not issued to the army as a whole. They were used by several regiments and then recalled. At Meerut, where the Mutiny broke out, they had never been issued at all. But the evil was done past recall. The Sepoys were convinced that this was but another step in the way of compelling them to break caste, a general belief already existing "amongst the Hindustani Sepoys that the destruction of their caste and religion had been finally resolved upon by the English as a means of forcing them to become Christians."[4]

But there were other causes for the rebellion than the discontent of the Sepoys, and there were other causes for the discontent of the Sepoys than those mentioned. "The causes and motives for sedition," says Bacon, "are innovations in religion, taxes, alteration of law and customs, breaking of privileges, general oppression, advancement of unworthy persons, strangers, deaths, disbanded soldiers, factions grown desperate and whatsoever in offending people joineth and knitteth them in a common cause." Throughout India and in all classes there was general disloyalty, dislike and distrust. "That there ever was anything like affection or loyal attachment, in any true sense of these terms, on the part of any considerable portion of the native population towards the British power, is what no one who really knows them could possibly aver," wrote Duff on September 5, 1857.[1] And he quotes approvingly, after pointing out the open enmity of the village population, the judgment of an interior resident: "In every instance where troops have mutinied they have been joined by the inhabitants not only of the bazaars, but of the towns and villages adjacent. . . . I am a very long resident in this country, and having been in a position to hear the true sentiments of the natives (who neither feared me nor required anything from me) towards our government and ourselves, I have long been aware of their hatred towards both, and that opportunity alone was wanted to display it as they have now done; and where it has not been shown, rest assured, it is only from fear or interest and when they did not recognize opportunity." There were people, undoubtedly, who did not believe this. That is one of Duff's strongest complaints, that the Government at home would not believe that the people at large were involved, but clung to the delusion that the "mutineers have not the confidence or sympathy of the general population." Sir Charles Trevelyan four years before the Mutiny broke, testified before the Parliamentary Committee: "There may be some peculiar classes who have suffered from the introduction of our administration, but even they are fast disappearing, and there can be no doubt that the prevailing sentiment of the native population is that our government is the government for them. . . . My firm opinion is that if a poll of the whole of the people of British India were taken by universal suffrage, the great majority would be in favour of the continuance of the Anglo-Indian Government." That is possible, but when the Mutineers seemed to be in the ascendant the great majority would undoubtedly have voted in favour of their continuance in authority. Duff declared the Mutiny to be "a rebellion, and a rebellion too of no recent or mushroom growth; every fresh revelation," he adds, perhaps with some exaggeration due to a nearness to the event which destroyed perspective, "tends more and more to confirm (this), and a rebellion long and deliberately concocted—a rebellion which has been able to array the Hindu and Mohammedan in an unnatural confederacy—a rebellion which is now manifestly nurtured and sustained by the whole population of Oudh, and directly or indirectly sympathized with and assisted by well nigh half that of the neighbouring provinces is not to be put down by a few victories over mutinous Sepoys, however decisive or brilliant."[1]

---

[1] "The Indian Mutiny is distinctly traceable to the opium trade with China" (Taylor, *One of China's Scholars*, p. 160).

[2] Lord Roberts, *Forty-one Years in India*, One Vol. Ed., pp. 241–4.

[3] *Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee on Indian Territories, 1853*, p. 143.

[4] Roberts, *Forty-one Years in India*, One Vol. Ed., p. 240.

---

[1] Duff *The Indian Rebellion*, p. 103.

The fact cannot now be gainsaid that there was a wide-spread hatred and distrust of the British. There were undoubtedly many individuals and some classes which thoroughly approved of the British rule. Its reforms had been for their benefit. They had discernment enough to see this. There were others who knew that the destruction of British power would mean the destruction of their privileges, which had come to them through it. Some sided with the British in the Mutiny from self-interest, believing that ultimately the British would be sure to win; others, doubtless from a belief that British rule was best. But in the main, the loyalty that was in the country was weak and quiescent in comparison with the dislike and distrust,—distrust which rested, too, rightly or wrongly, on the conviction in many minds of the unreliability and untrustworthiness of the Government. In a letter to Lord Canning, Sir Henry Lawrence wrote the day before the Mutiny broke out at Meerut, telling of a conversation with a "Brahmin native officer of the Oudh Artillery who was most persistent in his belief that the Government was determined to make the people of India Christians. He alluded especially to the new idea about enlistment, the object being, he said, to make the Sepoys go across the sea in order that they might be obliged to eat what we liked; and he argued that as we had made our way through India, had won Bhartpur, Lahore, etc., by fraud, so it might be possible that we would mix bonedust with grain sold to natives."[2]

---

[1] Duff, *The Indian Rebellion*, p. 229f.

[2] Roberts, *Forty-one Years in India*, One Vol. Ed., p. 244.

And this dislike and distrust of the British was shared by Mohammedan and Hindu alike. The incident of the greased cartridges seemed to the people to indicate a treacherous trick of the Government directed against both religions. And many things that had been done had prepared each section of the population to seize an opportunity to throw off British supremacy. The very virtues of British rule had angered the Hindus, and the more just and righteous the Government became, the greater became the Hindu ground for hatred and sedition. The Government, as we shall see, was considerate of their prejudices to the limit and beyond the limit of honour and uprightness. It preached its principle of religious neutrality, and strove to indicate its sensitiveness for native opinions and customs until its position became nauseous to the sense of straightforward and sincere men. But what angered the Hindus was the evident and undeniable hostility of the Government to outrages and wrongs and follies which they had always practiced under the name of religion. "The prohibition of suttee (burning widows on the funeral pyres of their husbands); the putting a stop to female infanticide, the execution of Brahmins for capital offences; the efforts of missionaries and the protection of their converts; the removal of all legal obstacles to the re-marriage of widows; the spread of Western and secular education generally; and more particularly, the attempt to introduce female education, were causes of alarm and disgust to the Brahmins and to those Hindus of high caste whose social privileges were connected with the Brahminical religion. Those arbiters of fate who were until then all powerful to control every act of their co-religionists, social, religious and political, were quick to perceive that their influence was menaced, and that their sway would in time be wrested from them, unless they could devise some means for overthrowing our government. They knew full well that the groundwork of their influence was ignorance and superstition. And they stood aghast at what they foresaw would be the inevitable result of enlightenment and progress. Railways and telegraphs were especially distasteful to the Brahmins; these evidences of ability and strength were too tangible to be pooh-poohed or explained away. Moreover, railways struck a direct blow at the system of caste, for on them people of every caste, high and low, were bound to travel together. . . . The fears and antagonisms of the Brahmins being thus aroused, it was natural that they should wish to see our rule upset, and they proceeded to poison the minds of the people with tales of the Government's determination to force Christianity upon them, and to make them believe that the continuance of our power meant the destruction of all they held most sacred."[1]

As for the Mohammedans, their religion demands the hatred of all infidels and cannot accept the yoke of infidel power. The superior strength of British arms had broken their dominion in India, but the memory of their past combined with the principles of their faith to keep alive in their hearts an implacable antagonism to the rule of the Kafirs.[2] "Ever since the British power became permanent, Islamism had been in the position of a tiger in a cage, impatient of confinement, but watching an opportunity to escape."[3] How intense this hatred was is indicated by the story of Khan Bahadur of Bareilly, who stood with Nana Sahib and Prince Feroze Shah of Delhi, and the Begum of Oudh in the last battle of the Rebellion, in the Northwest Provinces. Captured and condemned to death he was asked by Mr. Moens, the sheriff, as the cap was adjusted on the scaffold, whether he had anything to say. "Yes," was his reply, "I have two things to say: first, I hate you;" and then, with a glow of gratification on his face, "but, Moens, I have had the satisfaction of killing a thousand Christian dogs, and I would kill a thousand more now if I had the power."[4]

The mere establishment of order was unpopular. We may think otherwise, but we forget that in the Eastern lands centuries of custom have set life in certain grooves. There are great classes which live by the practice of principles not unknown among us, but not recognized as legitimate. All the institutions of such lands, and all relationships rest upon the acceptance of these principles by every one. To overturn them deprives thousands of their only means of livelihood, makes illegal what has become an integral part of custom and opinion, and creates at a stroke a thousand foes. These are not offset by the friends won from the class which profits by the change; for first it is the feeble class; secondly, it has long accepted the existing order as inevitable and resents stupidly any revolutionary change; and third, it is bound in many ways to the stronger class and will inevitably in some measure sympathize with it and follow it still. So that both among Hindus and Mohammedans many who were really benefited or seemed to be benefited by the progress of the land under British rule were as restless under the establishment of order, though with a duller spirit, than the Brahmins and the heirs of Mohammedan authority. Furthermore, in the East, all institutions and customs are bound up with religion, so that to interfere with these is to lay a sacrilegious hand on sacred things, and the lower classes are those who respond most inflammably to appeals based on religious prejudice. Speaking of the rural population, Duff said: "They dislike our government not because it is British, but because it is strong; just as they would positively dislike any other, whether native or foreign, which being equally strong would be equally capable of controlling their lawless predatory tendencies." [1] And again he declares that there were numbers spread over the provinces affected by the Mutiny, who would reason in reply to claims in behalf of the services of the British in establishing order, "Even admitting all that you allege in your own favour, there is still something so dull, dreary and monotonous in the iron uniformity of your sway, that we rather long for the stir and excitement of the olden times. Doubtless we were then constantly liable to become the victims of rapine and plunder; but as a counterpoise to that, we had an equal chance of self-aggrandizement, by similar means, in our turn. True, also, the exactions and demands of native princes were often ruinously oppressive, but then, we had it often in our power, by artifice or resistance, to evade them, while there is no escape from the clinching grip of your system of taxation. To speak the plain truth, we sigh for the return of the good old times, despite all their anarchy and misrule."[1] The Mutiny offered a vent to this natural feeling.

---

[1] Roberts, *Forty-one Years in India*, One Vol. Ed., p. 232.

[2] "There are many secondary causes of this movement, but it is now well ascertained, that the grand origin of the whole is a Mohammedan conspiracy to root out the English, and get the government back into Mohammedan hands. It may therefore be called a political, rather than a religious movement; yet religion is so blended with politics in Mohammedanism, that it is impossible to separate them. In this great political conspiracy, the very essence of the Mohammedan religion, which is hatred to Christ and Christians, has been an essential ingredient. The conspiracy has been in a secret process of formation for many months" (*The Home and Foreign Record*, Vol. IX, January, 1858, p. 16. From a letter of the Rev. J. Owen).

[3] Walsh, *The Martyred Missionaries*, p. 132.

[4] Butler, *The Land of the Veda*, p. 447.

---

[1] *The Indian Rebellion*, p. 179.

It must be acknowledged that there were other causes of discontent and distrust less creditable to the East India Company than these. The traditions of the old days of unlimited extortion and gain could not disappear in an hour, and the people felt that the British governed India for themselves. The taxes had been reduced, the courts of justice were infinitely superior to the old want of justice, and there were hundreds of the noblest men in the service ; but there was the feeling of distrust and there were sufficient actual grounds to justify it. For one thing, there was a host of inefficient men and of unworthy men in the service. Trevelyan had called India a sink, and that is what it was. Lord Roberts has called attention to the utter official disappearance of nearly every military officer who held a command on the staff in Bengal when the Mutiny's demands began to show the stuff that was in men. "Two Generals of divisions were removed from their commands, seven Brigadiers were found wanting in the hour of need, and out of the seventy-three regiments of Regular Cavalry and Infantry which mutinied, only four commanding officers were given other commands, younger officers being selected to raise and command the new regiments."[2] The Government was dependent, moreover, upon native agents, and these had the same reasons for private peculations and wrong-doing which they would have had under a native government, without some of the checks which the latter could have imposed ; while even British officials were often utterly ignorant of the real feelings of the people and dictatorial in their treatment of them. Duff complains of the ignorance even of members of the Supreme Council. "Thus it happens," he wrote to Dr. Tweedie, "that a disaffected feeling towards the British Government of a kind more or less definite has been gradually growing up even among the timid and passive inhabitants of Bengal. And yet, when any of the British residents who really know the people from constant and familiar converse with them, and who at the same time, are conscientiously among the most loyal subjects of the British crown, try to enlighten the

---

[1] *The Indian Rebellion*, p. 206f.

[2] Roberts, *Forty-one Years in India*, One Vol. Ed., p. 244.

Government on the subject, they only get cold rebuffs or insolent rebukes for their pains." Then Duff proceeds to plead in behalf of "the people who finding the burden of their wrongs to be intolerable may one day suddenly rise *en masse* and take the redress of grievances into their own hands." He speaks of "the oppressed millions of Bengal," and denounces the drowsy routine of old formalism in the Government, which should "address itself in right earnest to the great and glorious work of effective reform."

> "At present," he adds, "the position of Government or its apparent aspect towards the people at large, is deplorable in the extreme. With, it may be, the kindest and most equitable intentions on its part, the Government too much and too often, appears towards them in the attitude of a severe, unrighteous and inexorable tyrant. They have no direct way of knowing the mind of their rulers, the motives by which they are actuated, or the objects of rectitude and beneficence which they may contemplate. They can only judge of them through the conduct and proceedings of men who may be clothed more or less with Government authority, and with whom all their practical dealings must be carried on. The native police, for example, are indescribably treacherous and cruel; these are the servants of Government, and for their acts of oppression and cruelty, the Government of course gets the credit. The native officers that swarm about magistrates, judges, collectors and courts of justice, are indescribably immoral and corrupt; they are the servants of Government, or Government officials; and for all their dark deeds of falsity, perjury, bribe-taking the Government in popular estimation is held responsible. The zamindars, as a class, are indescribably avaricious and oppressive; they are upheld by Government in the exercise of rights that bear with extreme harshness on the wretched peasantry, and of all their extortionate exactions and other deeds of violence, the blame is almost universally imputed to the Government. Why, then, should not the Government for its own sake, and for the sake of an outraged but patient and enduring people, interfere at once, and with a high hand, to terminate such a doubly disastrous state of things? Instead of patching up a false and fatal peace—instead of silencing the cry of millions for redress by a volley of contemptuous and derisive scorn—why should they not truthfully admit that things are just what they are; and then, with the straightforwardness of Christian honesty, and the manliness of British energy, strive with the nerve and grasp of high statesmanship to remodel the police, the courts, the zamindar system? Thus proving themselves to be the best and truest friends, alike of landholder and people, why should they not earn for themselves renown instead of infamy,—a character for justice and benevolence, instead of a reputation for tyranny and wrong? It is surely a time that we should be done with the shame and trickeries of mere statecraft; and that we should unite in in-

augurating a new reign of good sense and good feeling, with truth and righteousness for the pillars of its throne, and kindliness and goodwill to men for its overshadowing canopy." [1]

It was but fair to quote thus at length the judgments of one of the ablest men in India, to indicate that the grounds for discontent among the people were not wholly fictitious or false ; and we shall confront presently a yet deeper cause than these for their suspicion and distrust.

But these surely were sufficient to supply any body of conspirators who wished to make use of them with ample material for arousing the people to hostile action against the established government. And unfortunately conspirators with both the ability and the will needed, were not wanting. The leading spirit among these, Colonel Malleson in his history of the Indian Mutiny, declares to have been a Maulvie or Mohammedan doctor named Ahmad Ullah, of Faizabad in Oudh, described by Sir Thomas Seaton as "a man of great abilities, of undaunted courage, of stern determination, and by far the best soldier among the rebels." Shortly after the annexation of Oudh in 1856 this man travelled over the Northwest Provinces on a mission, which was a mystery to the European authorities. He stayed some time at Agra, visited Delhi, Meerut, Patna and Calcutta. In April, 1857, shortly after his return, he circulated seditious papers in Oudh, was seized, tried and condemned to death, but before he was executed, the Mutiny broke out, and Ahmad Ullah escaped, and became the confidential friend of the Begum of Lucknow, the trusted leader of the rebels. It was Ahmad Ullah who devised the scheme of circulating chapatis, which are cakes of unleavened bread, among the rural population as a sign that the uprising was ready, as soon as the Sepoys were prepared for action. And it was probably he who discovered the value of the greased cartridge report as a means of inflaming the troops.

There were special reasons why the origin of the conspiracy should be in Oudh. The British had endeavoured to govern Oudh without annexing it, through the influence of a resident at the Court of the King ; but the corruption was so great and the oppression of the people so unbearable that at last the Court of Directors and the Ministers at home ordered Lord Dalhousie to proceed to the annexation of Oudh to the British territory, the king to be forced to abdicate. This was done with the first effect of arousing the fear and suspicion of all the Native States. If the British Government thus stepped in and deposed the king of Oudh and absorbed his kingdom, the rulers of the Native States argued, may not our turn come next ? The old balance of power between the British influence and the Native States—Mahratta, Rajput, Sikh or Mohammedan—was overthrown. British authority was now paramount, and the native rulers began to feel that they must make common cause against the encroachment of the resistless Power which ever pressed on and on from Calcutta, and never stopped. But there were other disturbing consequences of the annexation of Oudh. It was the home of the Sepoys in the Bengal army. The Madras Sepoys took no part in the Mutiny ; but nine-tenths of the Bengal Sepoys came from Oudh, and they were the troops who rose in rebellion. The annexation of Oudh had given them a personal grievance. The case may be stated thus, "The Sepoy so recruited (*i. e.*, in Oudh) possessed the right of petitioning the British resident at the Court of Lucknow on all matters affecting his own interests and the interests of his family in the Oudh dominion. The right of petition was a privilege the value of which can be realized by those who have any knowledge of the working of courts of justice in a native state. The Resident of Lucknow was in the eyes of the native judge the advocate of the petitioning Sepoy. The advantage of possessing so influential an advocate was so great that there was scarcely a family in Oudh which was not represented in the native army. Service in that army was consequently so popular that Oudh became the best recruiting ground in India. . . . All at once this privilege was swept away. . . . Oudh was annexed. . . . The annexation of Oudh was felt as a personal blow by every Sepoy in the Bengal army, because it deprived him of an immemorial privilege exercised by himself and his forefathers for years, and which secured to him a position of influence and importance in his own country. With the annexation that importance and that influence disappeared never to return. English officials succeeded the native judges. The right of petition was abolished. The great inducement to enlist disappeared."[1] The Oudh Sepoys felt that the Government had not acted in good faith in this. It was one of innumerable instances in which the personal interests of individuals or classes made them feel that the Government had betrayed explicit or implied pledges, when the Government was in fact acting in a larger interest or under the constraint of new necessities.

---

[1] Duff, *The Indian Rebellion*, pp. 295–297.

---

[1] Malleson, *The Indian Mutiny*, pp. 14–16.

In Oudh, morever, certain regulations regarding the land alienated the landowners, while the Talookdars, or Barons of Oudh, who had held themselves above law and defied their king to collect revenue from them or exact their obedience, along with the thousands of persons who made a living by the Court and their relations to its duties, intrigues, necessities and vices, and whose occupation was gone when annexation took place, were ready to join with frenzy in a movement against the British. The Northwest Provinces, also, Colonel Malleson holds to have been ripened for the revolt by interference with the old land laws prevailing under the village system, and the attempt to substitute for them, a more centralized scheme. And Lord Roberts recognizes the general dissatisfaction of the people with the Government's attempt "to introduce an equitable determination of rights and assessment of land revenues," as being one of the disposing causes of the uprising.

Besides the Oudh conspirators, including of course the deposed king, the other prominent figures were the family of the deposed Mogul Emperor of Delhi, and among the Hindus, Dunda Panth, better known as Nana Sahib. Nana Sahib was Prince of Bithor, and son of the Peshwa, or lord of all the Maratha princes. His father had been deprived of his dominions by the British. Upon his father's death, the son was denied both the title and pension. Nana Sahib accepted the judgment, but he nursed a hate of the English which afterwards bore bitter fruit. His agent in England, sent to prosecute his claims, returned to India only after visiting the seat of war in the Crimea, where he gained the idea, which doubtless he communicated to his master, that the British power was near dissolution and possibly that aid might be expected from Russia.[1]

Surely there is ample explanation in all this for the origin of the Indian Mutiny. It need only be added that for a long time there had been a superstitious idea abroad that the English raj or rule would come to an end at the close of one hundred years, and these years were dated from the battle of Plassey, June 23, 1757. "This idea was strengthened in the native mind by the fact that the 23d of June, 1857, was a date propitious alike for Hindus and Mohammedans." This was the great day of the annual Hindu festival of Ruth Jattra or pulling of the cars of Juggernath, and it was also the day for a new moon which the Mohammedans regarded as an auspicious omen. This added one more element of religious fervour to the heated spirits of the people, and if fury and hate could have triumphed against the purpose of God, British power, Western civilization and Christianity itself would have been swept forever out of India. Some creatures can be roused to such fury as to strike themselves and take their own lives.

---

[1] Butler, *The Land of the Veda*, p. 183f.; Hunter, *Brief History of the Indian Peoples*, p. 222.

The main question which the Indian Mutiny suggests to us has been deferred until now, in order that we might have before us the complexity of causes which led to the Rebellion, and be saved from the hasty judgment that because so much has been said both in the West and by the Indians regarding the relations of the Mutiny to the fear that the Government proposed to convert the people forcibly to Christianity, therefore Christianity and the missionary attempt to win India to the Christian faith were responsible for the uprising. Enough has been said to show that there were sufficient causes for the Mutiny, even eliminating entirely the question of Christianity. The religious terror of the people was played on by the conspirators, but the chief reasons for the Mutiny were the disaffection of the Sepoys prior to any suggestion of the greased cartridge, the discontent of the people of the Northwest Provinces and Oudh over the land question, the personal grievances of the conspirators themselves, and the general hatred of a foreign rule and all the innovations which it was introducing. That there was also a general fear of political Christianization is true, and its significance will be explained shortly. It is desirable to point out here, however, that even this fear of Christianity was not directed against the missionaries or their movement as such. "It ought to be emphatically noted," wrote Duff, "that nowhere has any special enmity or hostility been manifested towards them by the mutineers. Far from it. Such of them as fell in the way of the mutineers were simply dealt with in the same way as all other Europeans were dealt with. They belonged to the governing class, and as such must be destroyed to make way for the establishment of the old native Mohammedan dynasty. The same actuating motive led to the destruction of native Christians and all others who were friendly to the British Government. In this way it is known that many of the natives of Bengal, who from their superior English education were employed in government offices in the Northwest and were believed to be favourable to the continuance of our rule, were made to suffer severely, both in life and property. Some of them were sadly mutilated after the approved Mohammedan fashion, by having their noses slit up and ears cut off; while others, amid exposures and sufferings, had to effect the same hairbreadth escapes as the Europeans. In short, I feel more than ever persuaded of the reality of the conviction which I entertained from the very first, that this monster rebellion has been mainly of a political and but very subordinately of a religious character, and that the grand proximate agency in exciting it was a treasonable Mohammedan influence brought skillfully to bear on a soil prepared for its action by many concurring antecedent causes of disaffection and discontent. Brahminical and other influences had doubtless their share in it, but the preponderant central element has been of Mohammedan origin, directed to the realization of the long-cherished dynastic designs of Mohammedan ambitions. By the natives generally no special animosity has been exhibited towards the missionaries or their doings. The very contrary is the fact. On this subject the editor of the Calcutta *Christian Intelligencer*, a clergyman of the Church of England, has been able to bear emphatic testimony. 'If any European,' says he, 'is respected and trusted by the natives at present it is the missionary. All the influence of public officers and their agents at Benares could not succeed in procuring supplies for the troops, and others from the country round; but a missionary known to the people is now going round the villages and getting in supplies for the public service.'"[1]

---

[1] Duff, *The Indian Rebellion;* pp. 138 ff. "Sir W. Mackworth Young, the late Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab, speaking at the C. M. S. Anniversary said, 'Noble have been many of the spirits who have served India under Government; but I take off my hat to the humblest missionary who walks a bazaar in India, and that not because he belongs to a race in which are found the most conspicuous instances of heroism and self-sacrifice, not merely because he is called

There have been other views of the relation of Christianity to the Mutiny than this, but the facts show that Duff's judgment was correct, and that the Mutiny was predominantly political,—political conspiracy and hate using the religious argument with which to stir and embitter the common people. That they did use this argument, and that there was a belief that the Government intended to interfere with their own religions, there can be no doubt. In the evidence taken with reference to the outbreak at Meerut, Kulyan Singh, a resident of Meerut testified that on Sunday, May 10, 1857, about 6 P. M. he saw some cavalry sowars come by his shop, with drawn swords and pistols, calling out, "This war is in the cause of religion, whoever wishes to join may come along with us." "It is a fact," said Sir Charles Trevelyan, in his testimony already referred to, and quoting as his own the judgment of another official in India, "that communications have passed among the Mohammedans and pledges have been exchanged to rise if forcible conversion is attempted." This evidence might be multiplied indefinitely. The people did fear Christianity, but let it be noted, it was not so much the missionary type of Christianity, where everything depended upon the will of the individual, where all appeals were to personal choice and conscience, and each man was free to accept or reject. What the natives of India feared was the government enforcement of those reforms which are in very truth the results of Christianity, but which they identified with Christianity. They became frightened, accordingly, at the prospect of the forcible destruction of what was distinctive in their religions, and the forcible introduction of what seemed to them to be Christianity. For their religion was an external religion, a religion of custom, of caste, of usage, of rite—not as with us a religion of spirit and inner life. They regarded Christianity in the same light, and what the Government was doing in the introduction of certain Western customs and views, seemed to them the introduction of the Western religion. Just as their religions were external, so

---

of God and has a spiritual work to do, but because he is leading a *higher* life, and is doing a *grander* work than any other class of persons who are working in India. The strength of our position in India depends more largely upon the good will of the people than upon the strength and number of our garrisons, and for that good will we are largely indebted to the kindly self-sacrificing efforts of the *Christian Missionary* in his dealings with the people'" (*The Indian Standard*, Vol. XIII, No. 14).

everything external was religious, and they could not conceive that Western institutions and customs were not as truly the essential features of the Christian religion as caste and Koranic custom were the essential features of theirs. The fear and hatred of the people against Christianity, accordingly, were primarily against the government type, that is, against Western civilization—not against the missionary type, that is, the reformation of the personal character from within. They opposed the imposition of what they regarded as Christian habits from without, and their opposition to the missionary to the extent to which it existed, was not against him personally or against his methods, or even so much against his aims, so far as they were understood; but against him as a supposed representative of the Government, and they were opposed to his Christianity to the extent that they were opposed at all, because they were opposed to the Government, and not vice versa. And indeed they embraced the missionary in their wrath against the Government, not because of particular dislike or suspicion, but for want of discrimination between him and the Government, the latter filling their view and exciting their wrath.[1]

---

[1] ". . . I have as yet neither seen nor heard anything to make me believe that any conspiracy existed beyond the army; and even in it, one can scarcely say there was a conspiracy. The cartridge question was to my mind, indubitably, the immediate cause of the revolt. But the army had for a long time been in an unsatisfactory state. It had long seen and felt its power. We had gone on, year by year, adding to its numbers, without adding to our European force. Our contingents which, under better arrangements, might, like the Punjab troops have acted as counterpoise, were really a part of the army. All the men were 'Poorbeas.' The Bengal army was one great brotherhood, in which all the men felt and acted in union. Our treasuries, arsenals and forts were all garrisoned by them. As one letter I intercepted said, it was a saf mydan (a clear level) from Delhi to Calcutta, and as a Hindustani observed to a Sikh friend of mine, the proportion of European soldiers to Hindustani was about equal to the salt a man consumed in his chapati. The Mohammedans took advantage of the revolt to convert it into a religious and political affair. The missionaries and indeed religion, really speaking, had nothing to do with the matter. It was an affair of caste, personal impurity. Both Hindu and Mohammedan believed that we meant by a bit of legerdemain to make them all Christians. Religion, as you know, with them consists in matters of ceremony. Provided missionaries talk to them without acrimony, I believe they would never have objected to their talking forever on religion. This, however, only applies to the body of the people and to the soldiers. Of course there are many fanatics. A sense of power, then, defective discipline, and want of sufficient employment ruined the Bengal army. Reform was impracticable, for the officers would not admit that any was necessary, and nobody not in the army was supposed to know anything about it" (Letter from John Lawrence to Sir Charles Trevelyan, Dec. 16, 1857; Bosworth Smith, *Life of Lord Lawrence*, Vol. II, p. 251f.).

Both Mohammedans and Brahmins, writes a missionary of the day, "hated the British for the introduction of what they considered Christianity, not in its religious sense so much, as its elevating power. Whatever distinctions we may make, and think plain enough to be free from any disorganizing tendencies, it is proper to observe are not so regarded by others; and so it was with these two classes. The Government was particular to inform the people that they had nothing to do with Christianity as a system of religion; but the people unused to distinctions of this kind, attributed to Christianity the levelling influences of foreign rule and even handed justice. The very colleges of the Government from which Christianity was excluded, and in which the Shastras and Koran were taught, contributed to rivet this impression on the people. They taught and elevated men of low caste. They thus gave them an energy of character, an exaltation of mind, and a capacity for literary and scientific attainments, which must eventually overturn all their avowed and settled principles, and result in an entire reversion of everything favourable to their cherished system of society.

"These two classes were unanimous in their views and feelings of Christianity. They hated it for the severe system of morals it inculcated, the restraints it imposed, and the whole system of revolutionizing tendencies they imagined it contained and had power to exert. There can be no doubt they saw and felt, whatever may have been the estimate of their Christian rulers, that the British Government in India was the guardian and representative of Christianity there, and that it not only sheltered its advocates, but so protected them that no native subject could either touch or hinder those employed in its direct propagation.[1] They were encouraged so to think, because they saw the Government in all its officers wearing the garb and dress of Christianity, associating freely with the propagators of it, and in a great variety of ways patronizing it more or less avowedly. For these reasons the Government was by the great majority of the native population, regarded as patron and fountain of authority of the Christian religion. These opinions were formed without any reference to the light in which the Government and its officers viewed it, and in the teeth of affirmations made to the contrary, and prominently made known on all occasions. In their object and effort, therefore, to free themselves from all the evils they dreaded, they aimed this blow at the Government."[1]

---

[1] "This gradual tolerance of Christianity, the progress which it made towards admission within the circle of recognized Indian religions, the bold countenance of its thoroughgoing professors, and the perceptible inclination of the State's course under the increasing ripple of Western opinion—all these things did combine to arouse jealousy among the more sensitive Hindu and Mahomedan classes and interests. They saw that their faiths were losing their old exclusive privileges and they openly propounded the conclusion that the Government was undermining their religious constitutions with the object of proselytism. These ideas, which were abroad not long before the great eruption of mutiny and revolt in 1857, aided much to bring the native Indian mind into an inflammable condition; when the spark fell the rebels and mutineers went to the country with the cry of religion in danger, and the cry was very widely believed. All the proclamations issued from Delhi and Lucknow contained allusions to the invidious

This opinion of Mr. Walsh is not altogether sound. It would be perhaps more true to say that, in their object and effort to overthrow the Government, the rebels made use of religious motive and prejudice. But I have quoted it to indicate the distinction and yet confusion between the missionaries and their Christianity, and the Government and its Christianity. It might be said in passing, that possibly some missionaries and some government servants shared this confusion, and equally with the native religious leaders failed to make this distinction. At any rate, the fear of the people of the missionaries was as much due to their suspicion that they were agents of the Government as was their hatred of the Government due to the fact that they supposed it to be the agent of Christianity. It would seem to have been even more so, for in proportion as missions were spiritual, not political, they won the favour of the people and escaped their hostility to the Government. And furthermore, and to this vital consideration we shall return, when the government officials while strictly just and fair, were thorough, uncompromising Christian men

---

machinations of the English against the creeds of India; while natives about to be executed would offer to embrace Christianity if they might be spared, and would be astonished at discovering that this alternative was not permitted. On the neutrality question the effect of that bloody wrestle was natural enough. The old Puritanic intolerance, which still lies hid at the bottom of the hearts of so many English and Scots, was ominously rekindled, as big trees at last catch fire from blazing thorns, by the aggressive display of Indian fanaticism; and while the natives proclaimed that a treacherous Government had been detected in entrapping them into Christianity, English laymen went about saying that we were only suffering the divine chastisement that is surely brought down upon a nation by rulers that deny and degrade their own religion" (Lyall, *Asiatic Studies*, First Series, pp. 285, 286).

[1] Walsh, *The Martyred Missionaries*, pp. 134–136.

and lived their Christianity, the natives not only did not take offense at the Christianity, but did feel more kindly towards the Government. In other words, it was the connection between Christianity and Government that was feared and not so much Christianity itself, whether seen in a missionary or in a government official.

As Sir Charles Trevelyan testified, "The progress of the missionaries at first was slow and painful; they were looked upon with great suspicion by the natives. They were considered to be acting under false pretences, and to be really agents of the Government; and the native mind was in a state of great excitement and distrust regarding them; the cause of which was as follows: Government is a far more formidable machine in the East than it is in the West. Here we govern ourselves. Almost everything is done by local government administered by the people themselves. There everything is done by a great powerful centralized machine, which sweeps into its Treasury nearly the entire rent of the country, besides other large revenues; so that any direction which may be given to such a power must be extremely serious and important. The natives, generation after generation, have been accustomed to see this power turned to their forcible conversion. This idea was fixed in their minds. They fully expected that our government would follow in the course of its predecessors.[1] They believed that the missionaries were its agents. They were confirmed in this belief by observing that in those early days there were very few Europeans in India who were not servants of the Government. In fact, everybody else was an interloper. It was always assumed when an European appeared that he was connected with the Government. By slow degrees the natives got over this state of feeling. It is a remarkable circumstance that the timidity of the Government and the fear and even dislike with which they regarded the proceedings of the missionaries and the discouragement which they gave to them, was the main cause which produced the change of feeling among the natives. The establishment of the Serampore Mission is an instance in point. Those few humble men,

---

[1] Why should a people who had accepted forcible religious conversion from preceding conquerors fear it in this case so much more? It was conversion to a new kind of religion, a religion forbidding evasion, corruption, revenge, supported also by the even handed justice of the courts, or rather embodied in them and thus illustrated to the people.

Carey and Marshman, when they arrived in Calcutta penniless, and without even any superior education, were considered as dangerous, and they were forced to take refuge in the foreign settlement of Serampore. After that came the American missionaries. They were treated in a still more off hand way, and were sent away. That deportation of the American missionaries was the foundation of the Pegu Mission, which is one of the most flourishing in India, counting its converts by tens of thousands."[1] If the hostility of the people was primarily against Christianity, and not the Government, how can we account for the fact that the Christian missions left alone and viewed independently of the Government were accepted by the people and successful among them, on account of their independence? If it be said that this was before the adoption of reforms by the Government led the people to a new idea and greater fear of Christianity, it may be answered that Sir Charles Trevelyan's testimony was given long after Lord William Bentinck's reforms, and only four years before the Mutiny broke.

If it can be maintained that the distrust and suspicion which issued in the Mutiny were not primarily due to the popular hatred of Christianity in its religious sense—and it is not denied that there was such hatred, but only that it was the real cause of the Mutiny, which while actually military was yet in spirit a more or less national uprising against a foreign Government against which there were many grievances—we may now take another step and say that they were in some real measure due not to the Government's identification with Christianity as a religion, but to its betrayal of it and its policy of compromise, of concealment, of pitiable dalliance with idolatry and heathenism.[2] "Our duty, as rulers, was to preserve strict neutrality on all questions merely religious: and I am not aware that we have ever swerved from strict neutrality for the purpose of making proselytes to our own faith," said Macaulay in his speech on "The Gates of Somnauth," "but we have, I am sorry to say, sometimes deviated from the right path in the opposite direction. Some Englishmen, who have held high office in India, seem to have thought that the only religion which was not entitled to toleration and to respect was Christianity. They regarded every Christian missionary with extreme jealousy and disdain; and they suffered the most atrocious crimes, if enjoined by the Hindu superstition, to be perpetrated in open day."

---

[1] *Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee on Indian Territories, 1853*, p. 188.

[2] The Bombay Missionary Conference pointed out to Government, with compressed indignation, that, "According to the best information obtainable by your memorialists the number (26,589) of idol temples and shrines in the Bombay Presidency alone receiving support (by payments from the treasury and from sources under government control) from the Government is much larger than the number of Christian churches receiving government support in Great Britain, and scarcely, if at all, inferior to the entire number of churches of all Christian denominations whatsoever in the British Islands. If your memorialists are correctly informed . . . seven lakhs (£70,000) are annually expended from the government treasuries in the Bombay Presidency and a still larger sum (£87,678) in the Madras Presidency" (Lyall, *Asiatic Studies*, First Series, p. 291).

For years before the Mutiny the East India Company had resisted every effort to open India to Western ideas. It was a field for trade, and the Company strove to keep out all but its own servants, and to act upon the policy of squeezing all the money out of India that could be got, and concerning itself with the internal life of the people no more than was necessary to extend its trade. It was the pressure of opinion at home that forced into the Company's charter, upon its renewals in 1813 and 1833, the requirements that India should be open, and that the Company should concern itself with the welfare of the people. Especially had the Company entertained a dread of Christianity. Duff declared that perhaps the most distinguishing quality of the traditional policy of the Government had been "its shrinking dread, if not actual repudiation of Christianity and its co-relative pandering to heathenish prejudices."[1] In accordance with this policy the Company barred out the missionaries as long as possible. It would not allow Carey to sail on one of its ships or to reside on its territory when he reached India. It opposed every effort to disturb the superstitions of the people or stop their idolatries. Even the East India Company's chaplains were forbidden to evangelize the natives. "In 1830 when the Rev. G. Cranford (afterwards Sir G. Cranford, Bart.), was chaplain at Allahabad, several Sepoys came to him asking him to teach them Christianity; and at last they invited him to come into the lines and instruct them systematically. He went and found chair and desk ready, and began to teach. Presently up rushed the major of the regiment and exclaimed,

---

[1] Duff, *The Indian Rebellion*, p. 247.

'Preaching to the Sepoys, Mr. Cranford! You'll cause a Mutiny, sir, and we shall all be murdered at midnight!' 'Sir,' said Cranford, 'they asked me to come.' 'That, sir,' rejoined the major, 'must be false.' The matter was referred to Calcutta, and a peremptory order came to stop all such proceedings. The men were allowed, however, to visit the chaplain at his own house, and when they inquired why he could not come to the lines, they could not credit the reason; why, said they, should the Sahibs forbid their religion to be taught? Soon, under Cranford's instruction, several professed their faith in Christ and asked for baptism. Again the Calcutta authorities were referred to, and they positively prohibited it; and this was followed by a general order forbidding the chaplains to speak to the Sepoys of religion at all."[1] And at the very end of the life of the Company, Duff says that the Court of Directors closed their dispatch to the governor-general with reference to the appointment of some additional chaplains with the words, "The gentlemen appointed to these duties should be specially warned against any interference with the religion of the natives."[2]

Of course the theoretical policy of the Company was non-interference with native religions.[3] Its practice included their real support. Even until 1840 the British Government in India paid about 53,000 rupees annually for the support of the temple of Juggernath at Orissa, and it did the same or worse in hundreds of other cases. It truckled to caste distinctions in the most sickening and dishonourable ways. It disapproved a geography prepared for use in the Bengal schools on the ground that it was inconsistent with the Hindu Shastras. The book had been issued by a native publisher, and he wrote to inquire of the Junior Secretary of the Bengal Government whether it was desired that the geography should be brought into "consonance with the Shastras, should speak of six seas of milk, and place Benares in the centre of the earth and put the earth itself on a tortoise's back"? The representations of the Memorial presented by the English people to Parliament in 1857 were more than supported by the facts:

---

[1] Stock, *History of the Church Missionary Society*, Vol. II, p. 237.

[2] Duff, *The Indian Rebellion*, p. 320.

[3] Sir Alfred C. Lyall frankly and sympathetically expounds this policy: "From the beginning, indeed, of our dominion in the East, one of the cardinal principles upon which we administered the country has been Toleration. It was lucky for England that she got her firm footing in India at a period when religious enthusiasm was burning very low in the nation; neither within nor without the Church of the eighteenth century was there left any ardent spirit of proselytizing abroad, or of ecclesiastical domination at home (except over Irish Papists), and so we avoided the terrible blunders of fanaticism made by the European nations, who, in the preceding centuries, had gone before us eastward and westward, to India and to America, in the career of adventure and conquest. Moreover, toleration, meaning complete non-interference with the religions of the natives, was of such plain and profitable expediency with the East India Company in its earlier days, that not to have practiced it would have been downright insanity in an association whose object was to do business with Indians; wherefore the merchants who enforced a strict monopoly of material commerce were always careful to encourage free trade and unlimited speculation in religion. So the tradition of total abstinence from any religious policy grew up, and was maintained long after the Company had ceased to depend on the favour of Indian princes or priests, and had instead become arbiter of their destinies. We continued, as a great rising power, to survey all religions (including Christianity) with the most imperturbable and equitable indifference. We tolerated every superstitious rite or custom to the extent of carefully protecting it; any single institution or privilege of the natives that had in it a tincture of religious motive was hedged round with

"By professing to be neutral among the various religions of its Indian subjects, the Government has in effect denied the truth, and given a great moral advantage to those foolish, wicked and degrading systems to which the great bulk of the people adhere. Nor has the advantage thus given been merely moral. Idolatry has formally been and to some extent still is publicly patronized and subsidized. Its immodest and cruel rites have been honoured with the attendance of government officers and paid for from funds under government con-

---

respect, endowments were conscientiously left untouched, ecclesiastical grants and allowances to pious persons were scrupulously continued; in fact, the Company accepted all these liabilities created by its predecessors in rule as trusts, and assumed the office of administrator-general of charitable and religious legacies to every denomination. We disbursed impartially to Hindus, Mussulmans, and Parsees, to heretic and orthodox, to Juggernath's car, and to the shrine of a Mohammedan who died fighting against infidels, perhaps against ourselves. This was, on the whole, a conduct as wise and prudent as it was generally popular, for no anterior government had preserved such complete equipoise in its religious predilections; the Mohammedans had indulged in chronic outbursts of sheer persecution, while the Marathas often laid heavy taxes on Mohammedan endowments, if they did not entirely confiscate them in times of financial need. At the least every succeeding ruler provided largely and exclusively for the services of his own religion, and most rarely for any other; to do this much was not only the right of a conquering prince, but his duty, springing obviously out of the fact that he was bound to promote the spread of certain tenets or the glorification of certain divinities. On the other hand, the only tutelary deities which the Company, as a governing body, cared to propitiate were powerful personages in the flesh at home; and in India their chief officers were so cautious to disown any political connection with Christianity that popular prejudice occasionally supposed them to have no religion at all" (Lyall, *Asiatic Studies*, First Series, pp. 268–270).

trol. The system of caste which in every part of it contradicts and counteracts the Christian religion has been recognized in government arrangements for the administration of justice, as well as in the organization of the army, and selfish humanity and contempt for their fellow men have thus received the highest official sanction. The Government has discouraged the teaching of the Christian religion to certain classes of its subjects, and made the profession of it in a sense penal, by placing some who have been turned from idols to serve the living and true God under disabilities to which they were not before their conversion liable. And, while allowing the Koran and the Shastra to be freely used, it has forbidden the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, or even the answering of spontaneous inquiries respecting their contents, during school hours, in the educational institutions which it supports. In all these instances the Indian Government though professing neutrality in matters of religion, has practically countenanced and favoured falsehood and wickedness of the most flagitious kind."

It was not till 1832 that the old law under which a Hindu by change of religion became legally dead and forfeited his property and all family rights was declared by the supreme court to be no longer in force.[1] At Belgaum in the Deccan, the authorities declined to reward a native police officer who had saved the province from insurrectionary outbreak, on the ground that he was a Christian, and to reward him might excite native prejudices ! The Government refused to accept the services of the Krishnagar Christians in the hour of need because they were Christians, though Lord Canning accepted the offers of Hindus and Mohammedans. A Sepoy converted to Christianity was at once discharged from the army on the ground that he had become a Christian. It is worth while recalling that the only armies which mutinied were those from which Christians were excluded. In the Bengal army there was not a Christian. At the same time, in the Bombay army there were 359 Christians and in the Madras army 2,011, and neither of these revolted.[1] And so instances might be multiplied to show that the supposed policy of neutrality, of toleration, of equality was simply a policy of betrayal of Christianity. I am speaking in this of the general policy, not of the policy of some of the men who were serving the Company in India, and who operated the policy in a radically different way.

---

[1] "Up to the year 1831 native Christians had been placed under stringent civil disabilities by our own regulations, which formally adopted and regularly enforced the loose and intermittent usages of intolerance which they found in vogue; native Christians were excluded from practicing as pleaders, and from the subordinate official departments, although no such absolute rule of exclusion had ever been set up against them by Hindus or Mohammedans; while converts to Christianity were liable to be deprived, by reason of their conversion, not only of property, but of their wives and children; and they seem to have been generally treated as a petty sect, with whom no one need be at the trouble of using any sort of consideration. . . . But at this time the religious institutions and rites of the Hindus and Mohammedans were treated with deferential and scrupulous observance of the position which they held under native governments. All the customary honours, civil and military, were paid to shrines and images; the district magistrates continued to press men, according to ancient use, for dragging the cars of a famous idol, and declined to exempt Christians from this general *corvée;* we administered the endowments, paying over net rentals to priests or ministers; 'our interference extends over every detail of management; we regulated their funds, repaired their buildings, kept in order the cars and images, appointed their servants, and purveyed the various commodities required for us of the pagodas' (*Parliamentary Papers*, 1832). All these matters, however, were merely forms of harmless external observance which the executive might fairly recognize, just as the law courts would take cognizance of idolatrous customs and adjudicate thereupon. But there were other superstitious practices

By this policy the Company hoped to placate the religious prejudice and fear of the people. And its officers seem vainly to have supposed that in so doing, pursuing a policy by which, Duff declared, the British in India were exhibited as cowards in the eyes of man and traitors in the eyes of God,[2] they could keep the people at rest, however much they might deceive them elsewhere, and take advantage of dominant power over them. Falsehood to the Sepoys or what the Sepoys believed to be such,[3] injustice to Nana Sahib or what the Indian people regarded as such,[4] steady encroachment upon the rights and territories of the Native States under pretexts that were often spurious or purely mercenary or appeared to the natives to be so,[5]

---

plainly condemned by the first principles of Christian morality and decency, which yet, on account of their motive, were exempted by devout native opinion from the purview of the ordinary criminal law. During a long time the Company hesitated to interfere with such practices ; and this abstention was consistent with the particular stage of toleration at which our Government in India had then arrived" (Lyall, *Asiatic Studies*, First Series, pp. 273, 274).

[1] Stock, *Church Missionary Society History*, Vol. II, p. 237 ; *Life of Sir H. Edwardes*, Vol. II, p. 352.

[2] Duff, *The Indian Rebellion*, p. 252.

[3] Malleson, *The Indian Mutiny*, p. 8.

[4] *Ibid*, pp. 28–30.

[5] Roberts, *Forty-one Years in India*, One Vol. Ed., p. 236.

were not to be offset in the minds of the people by the one consideration that the men who were thus constantly deceiving and betraying them were equally willing to betray their own religion. I do not mean to imply that the suspicions of the natives were always just in these regards, though often they were; but I would point out that you cannot readily persuade men of the virtue of your acts who are daily beholding you treating your own religion with contempt, and other religions in a way howsoever sinuously considerate, yet unintelligible to the minds of those who are devoted to them. The course of the Government was futile and foolish. No men or nations ever gained anything by compromising their religion, by concealing it, or by dealing treacherously with its claims upon them.

And worse than this, the jealously maintained policy of neutrality not only did not allay distrust. It created it. The Mohammedans and Hindus could not conceive of a ruling power without a religion or without zeal for the diffusion of its own faith. Its denial, accordingly, was not believed. The people only became the more sure that it was just a blind to cover the designs of the British upon their customs. In consequence, the people more and more distrusted the Government, while they trusted more and more the missionaries with their open plans and open lives. "The Government who have always fondled and favoured superstition and idolatry," quotes Dr. Duff from a Calcutta paper, "are accused of an underhand design to cheat the people into Christianity; and the missionaries who have always openly and boldly, but still kindly and affectionately, denounced all idolatrous abominations and invited their deluded votaries to embrace the Gospel of Christ for their salvation—they are understood by the people; and if any Europeans are trusted the missionaries are at present."[1] And this was the testimony of the natives of India also. When the Mutiny broke out, Lord Ellenborough, a Company servant after its own heart, who would never have thought of the presumption of exalting Christ into the place of an idol or of interfering with widow-burning or immoral worship, declared that the Rebellion was provoked by a subscription made by Lord Canning to the work of missions. When this speech reached India, an association of native gentlemen, all heathen, held a meeting to denounce it, and after indignant speeches, passed a resolution unanimously denouncing Lord Ellenborough's suggestion as ridiculous and untrue, and the chief speaker, Babu Dakinaranjan Mukerji, said, "However we may differ with the Christian missionaries in religion, I speak the minds of our Society and generally of those of the people, when I say, that as regards their learning, purity of morals and disinterestedness of intention to promote our weal, no doubt is entertained throughout the land; nay, they are held by us in the highest esteem. European history does not bear on its record the mention of a class of men who suffered so many sacrifices in the cause of humanity and education as the Christian missionaries in India."

---

[1] Duff, *The Indian Rebellion*, p. 140.

It was not the missionaries or their movement which caused the Mutiny. In a true sense, as Sir Charles Napier put it, "What the people feared was not conversion, but contamination," and the course of the Government, intended to disarm such fear, fed it. If it had been openly and truly Christian it might, beyond any question, have escaped the Mutiny, and a good deal else that is laid up for the future. As a Hindu gentleman at Benares, a government Inspector of Schools, wrote to the Commissioner there at the height of the rebellion, "The people know that the Government is a Christian one; let it act openly as a true Christian; the people will never feel themselves disappointed, they will only admire it. You may have a thousand missionaries to preach, and another thousand as masters of schools, at the expense of the Government, or distribute a thousand Bibles at the hands of a governor-general. The people will not murmur a single syllable, though they may laugh and jeer. But take care that you do not interfere with their caste, that you do not force them to eat the food cooked by another in the jails, or thrust grease down their throats with the cartridges. I do not think such acts have anything to do with the Christian religion."

There was one part of India at least where the traditional policy of the Company did not prevail, and in that province there was no Mutiny, and from it deliverance came. I refer to the Punjab, and the influence there of John Lawrence and the men who like him were Christians and not cowards or traitors. They acted as Christian men in their public and private life. They invited the missionaries to the Punjab, and aided them in establishing their work. Lawrence did not believe in supporting idolatry or in compromising his own religion.

"Christian things," he declared, "done in a Christian way will never alienate the heathen. . . . It is when un-Christian things are done in the name of Christianity, or when Christian things are done in an un-Christian way that mischief and danger are occasioned." Not only did he abandon the traditional policy of the Company, but he marked out a new policy of Christian duty.[1] "It is not possible to introduce Western learning and science into India without leading its people to throw off their faith. If this position be correct, surely we are bound to give them facilities for acquiring a knowledge of the true faith. This is our true policy, not only as Christians, but as statesmen. In doing our duty towards them we should neither infringe the rights of conscience nor interfere with the free will of man, while we should be working in the true way to maintain our hold on India. Had the mutineers of the Bengal army possessed some insight into the principles of the Christian religion, they would never have been misled in the manner they were—they would never have banded themselves together to resist and to avenge imaginary wrongs. Ignorance, in all ages, has been productive of error and delusion. India has proved no exception to this rule. I pray that the misfortunes entailed by this Mutiny may teach England true wisdom, without which her tenure of India can never prove prosperous and enduring." In accordance with these principles, Lord Lawrence believed in an educational system which would exclude rigorously all the heathen religious teaching, and would provide as an integral part of the system, Bible instruction under competent teachers for "pupils willing to hear it." To his friend William Arnold, a son of Dr. Arnold of Rugby, and the director of Public Instruction in the

---

[1] Lawrence's conviction still abides in many minds. One of his recent successors, Sir W. Mackworth Young, K. C. S. I., late Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, gave an address at St. Michael's, Cornhill, on March 4, 1902, being one of a series of Lenten addresses by distinguished laymen on Foreign Missions, arranged by the C. M. S., and after referring to the administration of India and the loyalty of the people, remarked:

"Now I think no observant or thoughtful person, contemplating the remarkable fact of our power in the East, will fail to ask himself what, in God's providence, is the object of that power having been entrusted to us? And I think, further, that no true believer in Jesus Christ will fail to give the reply—that Christ may be made known through the length and breadth of the land." And as the result of a comparison of England and India, the speaker inferred that "India has been subordinated to us in order that we may communicate to her the secret of our own preëminence."

Punjab, who took strongly the opposite view and argued that the Founder of Christianity would Himself have disapproved of the measure, he wrote as follows:

> "I believe that, provided neither force nor fraud were used, Christ would assuredly approve of the introduction of the Bible. We believe that the Bible is true, that it is the only means of salvation. Surely we should lend our influence in making it known to our subjects. A Turk who acted up to his own convictions would only act consistently in inculcating the study of the Koran. But whether he acted rightly or wrongly in doing so, is for a higher judge to determine. As a matter of policy, I advocate the introduction of the Bible quite as much as a matter of duty. I believe that, provided we do it wisely, and judiciously, the people will gradually read that book. I have reason to suppose this because the missionaries are successful. On the other hand, nothing will more surely conduce to the strength of our power in India, than the spread of Christianity. You seem to think that we violate the principles of toleration by attempting to convert the people. I think you might just as well assume that we violate such principles by preferring in public office a respectable man to a reprobate, a wise man to a fool, and an industrious man to a lazy one. The whole question seems to me to resolve itself into what is the just interpretation of the term toleration. I consider that it means 'forbearance.' That is to say, we are to bear with and not to persecute mankind for their religious opinions. But this cannot mean that we should not strive by gentle means to lead those in the right way whom we see to be going wrong."[1]

And in his reply to Herbert Edwardes' memorandum on "the elimination of all non-Christian principles from the Government of India," in which Edwardes took positions more extreme than John Lawrence could approve, Lawrence dealt sympathetically with Edwardes' plea against the exclusion of the Bible and Christian teaching from the government schools:

> "In respect to the teaching of the Bible in government schools and colleges," his reply through his Secretary stated, "such teaching ought to be offered to all those who may be willing to receive it. The Bible ought not only to be placed among the college libraries and the school books, for the perusal of those who might choose to consult it; but, also, it should be taught in class wherever we have teachers fit to teach it and pupils willing to hear it. Such, broadly stated is the principle. That the time when it can be carried out in every school of every village and town throughout the length and breadth of the land may be hastened, is the aspiration of every Christian officer. But where are the means for doing this in the many thousands of schools in the interior of the country?

---

[1] Bosworth Smith, *Life of Lord Lawrence*, Vol. II, p. 272.

Supposing the pupils are forthcoming to hear, who is to read and expound to them the Bible? Is such a task to be intrusted to heathen schoolmasters, who might be, and but too often would be, enemies to Christianity, and who would be removed, not only from control, but even from the chances of correction? It may be said, indeed, that the Scriptures do not need interpreters and may be read by any one; but still it might be possible for a village schoolmaster averse to Christianity to read and explain the Scriptures in an irreverent and improper manner. And then the strongest advocates of religious teaching would admit that the Bible had better not be read and explained in a perverse, captious and sneering manner. If then the Bible is to be taught only by fitting persons, it will be admitted that our means are, unhappily, but very limited. This difficulty does not seem to have fully struck Colonel Edwardes; but it has been noted by Mr. Macleod, who suggests that Bible classes should be formed only in those government schools where a chaplain or some other Christian and devout person, European or native, might be found to undertake the teaching. That some such rule must in practice be observed seems certain. But then it will be obvious at a glance that such teachers must be extremely few. That the number will increase may, indeed, be hoped, and very possibly, native teachers will be found of good characters and thoughtful minds, who, though not actually baptized Christians, are yet well disposed, and might be intrusted with the reading of the Bible to classes. But, at the best, the reading of the Bible in class must practically be restricted to but a small proportion of the government schools. In these latter there ought to be, the Chief Commissioner considers, regular Bible classes held by a qualified person as above described, for all those who might be willing to attend. There is a good hope that such attendance would not be small; but, however small it might be, the class ought to be held, in order that our views of Christian duty might be patent to the native public, and in the trust that the example might not be without effect. The formation of Bible classes of an approved character in as many schools as possible should be a recognized branch of the educational department. Inspectors should endeavour to establish them in the same way as they originate improvements of other kinds, and the subject should be properly mentioned in all periodical reports. But on the other hand, the Chief Commissioner would never admit that the unavoidable absence of Bible classes should be used as an argument against the establishment of schools unaccompanied by Christian teaching. If Government is not to establish a school in a village unless it can find a man fit to read the Bible, and boys willing to hear it, then there is no doubt that at first such a condition could not be fulfilled in the vast majority of cases; and the result would be that light and knowledge would be shut out from the mass of the population. A purely secular system is not, the Chief Commissioner believes, in India at least, adverse to religious influences, nor worthless without simultaneous religious instruction. On the contrary, the spread of European knowledge among the natives is, as it were, a pioneer to the progress of Christianity. The opinion of missionaries in Upper India at least, may be confidently appealed to on this point. If this be the case, then, having established all the Bible classes we could, having done our best to augment their number, having practically shown to the world by our educational rules that we do desire that the Bible should be read and taught, we may, as Mr. Macleod has appropriately expressed it, hope that 'a blessing would not be denied to our system' of secular education. But, so far as the native religions are concerned, the Chief Commissioner considers that the education should be purely and entirely secular. These religions ought not to be taught in the government schools. Such teaching would indeed be superfluous. The natives have ample means of their own for this purpose and need no aid. But, if they did need aid, it is not our business to afford such. The case is of course utterly different as regards Christianity. Of that religion, the native can have no knowledge except through our instrumentality and preference, which it is our right and duty to give to what we believe to be the truth. But while we say that Christianity shall be the only religion taught in our schools, we ought not, the Chief Commissioner considers, to render attendance on Bible classes compulsory or obligatory. If Colonel Edwardes would render it thus obligatory—if he means that every pupil if he attend school at all, must attend the Bible class, should there be one—then the Chief Commissioner entirely dissents from this view. So long as the attendance is voluntary there will be boys to attend; but if it be obligatory, then suspicion is aroused, and there is some chance of empty benches. Moreover, as a matter of principle, the Chief Commissioner believes that, if anything like compulsion enters into our system of diffusing Christianity, the rules of that religion itself are disobeyed, and that we shall never be permitted to profit by our disobedience. The wrong means for a right end will recoil upon ourselves, and we shall only steel people to resistance where we might have persuaded them."[1]

And Lawrence held that the British Government in India "is, as all other governments are, established for the good of the people. But while with other governments the popular will is generally the criterion of the public good, such is not always the case with us in India. . . . We have not been elected or placed in power by the people, but we are here through our moral superiority, by the force of circumstances, by the will of Providence. This alone constitutes our charter to govern India. In doing the best we can for the people, we are bound by our conscience, and not by theirs."[2]

---

[1] Bosworth Smith, *Life of Lord Lawrence*, Vol. II, pp. 273–275.

[2] "Although I appreciate to the full the anxiety of the Government to abstain from all active interference in religious matters in this country, and to remain absolutely neutral, I cannot help thinking that this anxiety to preserve strict neutrality is sometimes carried to excess and is made to appear almost like veiled hostility. For the physical welfare of the people of India the Government provides hospitals, dispensaries, medicines and doctors, and a large part of the revenue is devoted to these objects. The people are not compelled to go to the

In those words John Lawrence summed up the Christian view and uttered final condemnation of the traditional policy of the East India Company.

The Indian Mutiny sealed the doom of the Company and its policies. In 1858 India was transferred to the British Crown. The Queen's Proclamation declared that there should be no imposition of Christian convictions upon the people of India by the Government. It declared that there should be absolute freedom of religion. It forbade government officials to interfere with the religious belief or worship of the people. And it declared that Great Britain was a Christian nation, and that her reliance was on the truth of Christianity. It is of interest to note that the distinctively Christian words of the Proclamation were added by the Queen herself.[1] The

---

dispensaries, or consult the doctors, or take the medicines; they are simply told that in the opinion of the Government their ailments will be most successfully and humanely treated by these medicines at the hands of these doctors; the best remedies which the Government can procure are presented for their acceptance. So also in education. The Government tries to provide the best means of improving the minds of the people; very large sums are spent on universities, schools and text-books, professors and masters, and these are presented to the people for their acceptance if they will:—in fact, in education a certain indirect pressure is exercised. It is therefore a mystery to me that the Government does not, in like manner, present to the people—at least for their consideration, the Bible—the one great means, as we believe of salvation for their souls; the one great remedy which, as a Christian government, we believe to be most effectual for raising millions from their degradation. There would be no compulsion, no pressure, any more than in medicine or education; and the simple offer would be no violation of neutrality. Even as a perfect moral example the life of Christ would be an invaluable help to the youth of India, and I cannot for the life of me see why the Bible should not be permitted to be at least an optional study in the schools and universities" (The Honourable Donald M. Smeaton, C. S. I., at the annual meeting of the India Sunday-school Union, quoted in *Makhzan I Masihi*, March 15, 1902).

The editor of the *Makhzan*, a missionary, adds: "While we most heartily appreciate the spirit which prompted these words, yet there are so many real difficulties in the way of Government providing Biblical instruction that we could not join in asking Government to undertake it. In justice the Government would be required to provide for the teaching of the Koran, the Vedas and Shastras. We believe that the Government as such, should not interfere in purely religious matters. We quite agree with Mr. Smeaton that the desire to preserve strict neutrality is sometimes carried to excess, so that the people now and then draw the inference that the Government is hostile to the Christian religion. It is a cause of great thankfulness that we have never lacked in India Christian men in high places who on proper occasions have made known their faith in Christ, and we are glad to know that the succession of such men is not extinct. When they cease from the rule of the land it will not be many decades before Ichabod is written large everywhere."

[1] Stock, *History of Church Missionary Society*, Vol. II, p. 253.

Proclamation was interpreted in the Madras Presidency to mean that "officers of the Government, whether Christian, Mohammedan or Hindu have a right in their private capacity to recommend their respective religions by all proper means." And this view has now come to prevail throughout India. And it is one blessed result of the Mutiny.

Even to-day, however, the principle of neutrality shows itself to be a principle difficult of application. The government system of education is neutral; but its influence is unquestionably anti-Christian. The Viceroy is neutral, but in a recent address to the Mohammedan students of Aligarh College, Lord Curzon used words which could only mean to them a counsel not to accept Christianity: "Adhere to your own religion which has in it the ingredients of great nobility and of profound truth, and make it the basis of your institutions."[1] And he has recently presented to a Mohammedan place of worship a Koran-stand and a lamp. It is doubtful if John Lawrence would have chosen to make presents to mosques and temples in order to express his sympathy for the people under his care. Still, there has been an immense gain since the day when Christianity was a disqualification for government service, and the Government paid the expenses of heathen ceremonies and sent official representatives to vile worship in heathen temples. And the sense of responsibility, of great duty has grown with each year.

The Mutiny ended the policy of compromise. It led to an immense increase of British prestige. It settled principles regarding the army and the Government. It produced a great improvement in the condition of the native Christians, and it has secured for the people of India, curiously enough, a larger share in the administration of a government which they tried furiously to destroy. It has taught the people of the land a bitter lesson, and softened its sting with the beneficent kindness of a conquest which has sought the good of the people, and destroyed the power of a government which ruled first for trade alone, and then for the sake of ruling. It closed the issue of progress or stagnation, and settled once and for all that India must move on under the influence of the principles of the West, and accept the changes which come without regard to the superstitions and age-old prejudices with which they collide. The Mutiny was one of those experiences in national life which close the doors upon the past, and bolt them, and force the people out into a new way in which their fathers did not walk.

---

[1] *Makhzan I Masihi*, June 15, 1901.

And the Indian Rebellion is full of significance for us to-day. It is interesting to note in it and in the opinions of men about it, so many parallels to the Boxer Uprising in China. For that, as for this, some have tried to lay the blame upon the missionaries, and have proposed as the wise course for the future their withdrawal. The editor of the *United Service Magazine*, declared when the news of the outbreak reached London: "Missionaries must be sent away about their business, and the practice of attempting conversions be put immediate stop to."[1] And in much that has been said of the causes of the Mutiny and the real issues involved, it would be possible with but slight modification to insert the words "Boxer Uprising" for "Indian Rebellion."

The Mutiny taught strongly the needed lesson that educational and external culture do not necessarily produce any change of character. Nana Sahib was a man of polished manners and refinement, the associate of British officers and civilians; and he delighted himself during the Mutiny with the massacre of women and little children, and the butchery of those who had surrendered on his pledge of protection. The Indian system of education is turning out annually hosts of young men of the same capacity;—men with trained minds and no morals, disqualified for work and unable to secure a government position. To the extent that they might have Nana Sahib's capacity to act and as strong a motive for acting so, they would furnish the material for any new seditious movement against British power in India.[2]

Education, the transfer of government to the crown, a thin wash of civilization—these things are not capable of producing the vital change in the people that is required. Some power is needed which can get at the roots of character, and work radical transformation there.[3]

---

[1] *United Service Magazine*, 1857, p. 480.

[2] Monier Williams, *Modern India and the Indians*, p. 300.

[3] "Little penetration is needed to anticipate the intellectual and moral effects of a state of transition whenever the traditional forms of religious belief shall come to have fallen into universal discredit with the reflective and influential classes,

The real weaknesses of Indian life were once again revealed by the Mutiny. Some were blinded, as many are still, by the superficial attractiveness of the people and their evident religiousness. The Mutiny uncovered what lay beneath, and showed once more that the worst in both Mohammedan and Hindu peoples is both sanctioned by their religion and inseparably bound up with it. Sir Charles Trevelyan represents some Hindus saying of another, who was a thug and was to be hanged, "Why do you hang So and So? It is a pity that you should hang him; he is such a religious, good man; so exemplary in all the relations of life; such a good husband; such a good father; you should not hang him." And he says that when with some others he joined to form a society to put down cruel native practices, and they went into the subject, they found "that all these practices were so mixed up with the Hindu religious system, and grew so directly out of it, that nothing short of the conversion of the natives to Christianity would affect any real moral change."[1] "I must add," he says, "that there is no more impracticable subject, from a religious point of view, than a Hindu who has been brought up according to the perfect manner of the law of his fathers." The

---

who may have found nothing to substitute for these beliefs but a superficial instruction; while at the same time the rapid advance of prosperity, and the opening of a new world of material needs and allurements, shall have made men restless and discontented. These things may be still far distant in India, where European ideas have as yet touched only the outskirts of our dominion, and are only appreciated in a kind of second-hand, unreal way by the artificial classes which are politically bound up with the English rule, to which they owe their existence. Nevertheless, our successors may one day be reminded of the picture drawn in the forcible passage [from De Tocqueville] which here follows, and which brings this chapter to its conclusion:—

"'But epochs sometimes occur, in the course of the existence of a nation, at which the ancient customs of a people are changed, religious belief disturbed, and the spell of tradition broken; while the diffusion of knowledge is yet imperfect, and the civil rights of the community are ill secured, or confined within very narrow limits. The country then assumes a dim and dubious shape in the eyes of the citizens; they no longer behold it in the soil which they inhabit, for that soil is to them a dull inanimate clod; nor in the usages of their forefathers, which they have been taught to look upon as a debasing yoke; nor in religion, for of that they doubt; nor in the laws, which do not originate in their own authority. . . . They entrench themselves within the dull precincts of a narrow egotism. They are emancipated from prejudice, without having acknowledged the empire of reason; they are animated neither by instinctive patriotism nor by thinking patriotism . . . but they have stopped halfway between the two, in the midst of confusion and distress'" (Lyall, *Asiatic Studies*, First Series, p. 160f.).

[1] *Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee on Indian Territories, 1853*, p. 183f.

Mutiny through Nana Sahib, Khan Bahadur, and a thousand others laid bare all the treacheries, the cruelties, the falsehoods, the hideous crimes which Hinduism and Islam alike allow and beget.

And, accordingly, it confirmed the conviction of Christian men and women as to the necessity of the evangelization of India, even as it attracted to India the attention of the world. The sight of such need of the Gospel and the inspiration of the heroic deaths of many missionaries and others who lived and died for Christ as well as for British sovereignty, aroused a profound missionary interest in all lands. And besides this, a new motive for the Christianization of India appeared. It was perceived that the only really reliable loyalty in India was found in the Christians, and it began slowly to dawn on British statesmen that the only way to bridge the chasm between India and England, and to create real sympathy and confidence between them was to make India Christian, to throw across the chasm of race and opinion the only bridge that can ever span it—the bridge of a common religious faith. The Prime Minister himself declared it to be the interest of Great Britain to promote the diffusion of Christianity far and wide through India. "As to lovers of us or of our rule," wrote Duff, perhaps unjustly, "probably there are none among any class except the comparatively small body of professing native Christians." And that is the only hope of ever binding India to Great Britain. "I must add my belief," said Sir Donald McLeod, one of John Lawrence's school of Indian officials, and himself Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab, "that if we have any regard to the security of our dominion in India, it is indispensable that we do our utmost to make it a Christian country."[1] The chasm that separates India from England is no narrow chasm, and it does not grow narrower by the influence of civilization and education. "I wish I could bring home to you—to you who may not have been in India," said the Bishop of Calcutta recently at Oxford, "how vast is the gulf between East and West. I had no conception of it when I went out to India—it almost breaks my heart now. If I ever felt," he adds, "during my period of life in India that the gulf between East and West is in any measure bridged over, it has been when I have seen Europeans and natives kneeling side by side in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper."[1]

---

[1] Smith, *Twelve Indian Statesmen*, p. 155.

And if Great Britain has any sincere purpose to prepare India for self-government, as well as any desire to keep India in loyalty and contentment until the day of her autonomy comes, the Christianization of India is the only course open to her. "We have two advantages," said Sir Charles Trevelyan, "to confer upon the natives of India which the Romans did not have to confer upon the people they subjugated. One of them is constitutional freedom, and the other is Christianity. Now these two will make a people of India at some distant period, capable of self-government and self-defence." [1]

---

[1] *Church Missionary Intelligencer*, July, 1901, p. 536.

"In Dr. Hunter's book on the Indian Mussulmans there is a chapter, entitled 'the chronic conspiracy within our territory,' in which is described the religious agitation which, under the influence of Wahabite preachers, constantly rouses against our Government (according to Dr. Hunter, but others deny this) just that part of the population which has the proudest memories, and therefore the keenest sense of indignation against the race that has superseded them. Brahminism, though a tenacious, is a much less inspiring religion. Still we all remember the greased cartridges. The Mutiny of 1857, though mainly military, yet had a religious beginning. It shows us what we might expect if the vast Hindu population came to believe that their religion was attacked. And we are to bear in mind that the Hindu religion is not, like the Mohammedan, outside the region which science claims as its own. We have always declared that we held sacred the principle of religious toleration, and on that understanding, we are obeyed; but what if the Hindu should come to regard the teaching of European science as being of itself an attack on his religion?

"Great religious movements then seem less improbable than a nationality movement. On the other hand the religious forces, if they are livelier, neutralize each other more directly. Islam and Hinduism confront each other, the one stronger in faith, the other in number, and create a sort of equilibrium. Is it conceivable that we may some day find our Christianity a reconciling element between ourselves and these contending religions? We are to remember that, as Islam is the crudest expression of Semitic religion,Brahminism, on the other hand is an expression of Aryan thought. Now among the religions of the world, Christianity stands out as a product of the fusion of Semitic with Aryan ideas. It may be said that India and Europe in respect of religion have both the same elements, but that in India the elements have not blended, while in Europe, they have united with Christianity. Judaism and classical Paganism were in Europe at the beginning of our era, what Mohammedanism and Brahminism are now in India; but in India the elements have remained separate, and have only made occasional efforts to unite, as in the Sikh religion and in the religion of Akbar. In Europe a great fusion took place by means of the Christian Church, which fusion has throughout modern history been growing more and more complete" (Seeley, *The Expansion of England*, p. 322f.).

"That these superstitions will be perpetually toning down, and becoming civilized with the general civilization of India, is a matter of course; but whether they will be replaced by a complete adoption of any other religion is very questionable, though the great precedent of Christianity in the Roman Empire cannot be disregarded, despite the wide divergencies of ages and circumstances of every kind" (Lyall, *Asiatic Studies*, First Series, p. 158).

"My friends," exclaimed Sir Herbert Edwardes, one of John Lawrence's associates, in a great speech in England after the Mutiny, setting forth the "nine striking facts connected with the Mutiny which could only be attributed to Divine interposition," "My friends, these things are wonderful. In them we hear the voice of God, and what says that voice? That voice says, 'India is your charge. I am the Lord of the world. I give kingdoms as I list. I gave India into the hands of England. I did not give it solely for your benefit. I gave it for the benefit of my one hundred and eighty millions of creatures. I gave it to you to whom I have given the best thing man can have—the Bible, the knowledge of the only true God. I gave it to you that you might communicate My light and knowledge and truth to these My heathen creatures. You have neglected the charge I gave you. You have ruled India for yourselves, and I have chastened you; I have humbled you in your pride. I have brought you even to the dust—I have brought you within one step of ruin. But I have condoned your offences. I have raised you up. When no mortal hand could save you from your own policy, I, the God whom you have offended, have come to your assistance. I have lifted you up again, and I say unto you, England, that I once more consign this people to your charge. I say to you that I once more put you upon your trial, and I say to you, take warning from the past."

"And my friends," continued Edwardes, "let us take warning! Let us not only take warning, let us take courage. It is not the language of fanaticism which says, 'Christianize your policy.' It is the language of sound wisdom; it is the language of experience. I say that the Christian policy is the only policy of hope. . . . Stand avowedly as a Christian government. Follow the noble example of your Queen. Declare yourselves in the face of the Indian people a Christian nation, as Her Majesty has declared herself a Christian Queen, and you will not only do honour to her, but to your God, and in that alone you will find that true safety rests." [2]

---

[1] *Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee on Indian Territories 1853*, p. 177.

[2] Stock, *History of the Church Missionary Society*, Vol. II, p. 232f.

Those were true words for the day and the nation for which they were uttered. They are as true for us now in our relations with the Philippines, and in all our other relations, as they were for Great Britain in 1860, before the thunders of the Indian Mutiny had died away.

The Religion of the Bab

III

THE RELIGION OF THE BAB

IT is a difficult task to form a just judgment of contemporaneous events. Time is required in the study of history to supply perspective, to reveal relationships and to disclose the real dimensions alike of movements and of men. It is not surprising, accordingly, that the movement to be discussed in this chapter is practically unknown, and that though it has shaped the lives of thousands and been sobered by many martyrdoms it has found no place as yet in our interest. Perhaps within the past three years, however, many who had never heard of the religion of the Bab in Persia, have at least been made aware of the existence of such a faith somewhere in the world, by reports of its spread in our own land, and have come thus, because it interested a few hundred of our own people, to take an interest in a movement which had already shaken a whole nation, and was slowly undermining there one branch of the most bitter and fanatical foe which Christianity confronts. Babism should be familiar to us because it is the chief concern in the lives of increasing multitudes in Persia. It is one of the most remarkable movements of our day, beside, because its object, however concealed and even unrecognized by Babis themselves, is "nothing less than the complete overthrow of Islam and the abrogation of its ordinances." [1] The external attacks on Islam, both Sunni and Shiah, have as yet accomplished but a little part of what they desire. Babism is a convulsive upheaval from within the Shiah wing of the faith.[2]

---

[1] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. 187.

[2] The Rev. P. Z. Easton, formerly of Tabriz, takes a less unfavourable view of the Bab and his religion than is set forth in this chapter. He kindly writes in comment:

"All that is essential in Babism is old. Browne says that 'Persia is, and always has been, a very hotbed of systems from the time of Manes and Mazdak in the old Sassanian days, down to the present age, which has brought into being the Babis and the Sheikhies' (*A Year Among the Persians*, p. 122). We may go still further back to the Avesta and to those pre-Zoroastrian sages, out of which the Yashts are formed. Outside of a certain admixture of Occidental science and

Mirza Ali Mohammed, later called the Bab, the founder of this religion, was born at Shiraz, in southern Persia, on October 9, 1820. He was a Sayid, or descendant of Mohammed. His father, who was a grocer, died while his son was yet a lad, and the boy was placed

philanthropy, introduced largely for foreign consumption and in order to give an up to date stamp or colouring to the movement, there is scarcely anything that distinguishes Babism from its predecessors. The subject is one that is inextricably interwoven with the whole course of Persian history in all its departments, political, religious, social and philosophical. The materials are exceedingly rich and abundant, and time has pronounced its verdict again and again in the most unmistakable manner. So deep a hold have the ideas, which lie at the foundation of Babism and similar sects, taken of the minds and hearts of the people, that it may be said that as every American is a possible president, so every Persian is a possible murshid. For every sect that comes out to the light of day and makes its appearance on the page of history, there are hundreds, perhaps thousands, of embryo sects, of whose existence no one knows outside of a very limited circle."

He adds that Babism is not content with the overthrow of Islam:

"More than this. It is to be classed with the Assassins which Von Hammer calls 'the union of impostors and dupes which, under the mask of a more austere creed and severer morals, undermined all religion and morality' (Von Hammer, *History of the Assassins*, p. 2). 'To believe nothing and to dare all, was, in two words, the sum of this system, which annihilated every principle of religion and morality, and had no other object than to execute ambitious designs with suitable ministers, who, daring all and honouring nothing, since they consider everything a cheat and nothing forbidden, are the best tools of an infernal policy. A system, which, with no other aim than the gratification of an insatiable lust of dominion, instead of seeking the highest of human objects, precipitates itself into the abyss, and mangling itself, is buried amidst the ruins of thrones and altars, the horrors of anarchy, the wreck of national happiness, and the universal execration of mankind, (*Ibid*, pp. 36, 37).

"At length, with fiendish laugh, like that which broke
From Iblis at the Fall of Man, he spoke;
'Yes, ye vile race, for hell's amusement given,
Too mean for earth, yet claiming kin with heaven:
God's images, forsooth! such Gods as he,
Whom India serves, the monkey deity;
Ye creatures of a breath, proud things of clay,
To whom if Lucifer, as grandams say,
Refused, though at the forfeit of heaven's light,
To bend in worship, Lucifer was light!
Soon shall I plant this foot upon the neck
Of your foul race, and without fear or check,
Luxuriating in hate, avenge my shame,
My deep-felt, long-nurst loathing of man's name,
Soon at the head of myriads, blind and fierce,
As hooded falcons, through the universe,
I'll sweep my darkening, desolating way,
Weak man my instrument, curst man my prey!'

—Mokanna's soliloquy in *Lalla Rookh*.

"'Its tone (Wady Mirza Jani's History) towards *all* beyond the pale of the under the care of an uncle, and at the age of fifteen was sent to Bushire, to help in his uncle's business, and subsequently he engaged in business alone. "He was noted for godliness, devoutness, virtue and piety," says one of the Babi books, "and was regarded in the sight of men as so characterized."[1] An earlier book, however, is not content with this temperate statement, but deals in more remarkable evidences of his exceptional character. Thus the *Tarikh-I-Jadid* or *New History*, states:

> "At the moment of his birth he exclaimed 'The kingdom is God's!' And in his boyhood they sent him to be taught his lessons by Sheikh Alid, an accomplished scholar and a godly man, who was one of the disciples of Sheikh Ahmad of Ahsa, and subsequently became an ardent believer in His Holiness. Amongst other anecdotes of the Bab's boyhood which he used to relate, one was as follows: The first day that they brought him to me at school, I wrote down the alphabet for him to learn, as is customary with children. After a while I went out on business. On my return I heard, as I approached the room, some one reading the Koran in a sweet and plaintive voice. Filled with astonishment, I entered the room and inquired who had been reading the Koran. The other children answered, pointing to His Holiness, 'He was.' 'Have you read the Koran?' I asked. He was silent. 'It is best for you to read Persian books,' said I, putting the Hakku'l-Yakin before him, 'read from this.' At whatever page I opened it I saw that he could read it easily. 'You have read Persian,' I said. 'Come read some Arabic, that will be better.' So saying, I placed before him the Sharh-i-amthila. When I began to explain the meaning of the Bismi'llah to the pupils in the customary manner, he asked, 'Why does the word Rahman in-

church, and more especially towards the Shah of Persia, and his Government, was irreconcilably hostile, (*Tarikh I Jadid*, xxviii)."

With reference to the alleged wonders in connection with Babism, Mr. Easton says:

"Persian flattery, Persian imagination and Persian falsehood easily account for the wonders mentioned. I was present one day at the Foreign Agent's office in Tabriz, when some farashes, who had been sent to bring certain individuals, came back and reported that a mob of 500 people had resisted them. I looked into the matter and found that the 500 were five."

Of this last view of Mr. Easton's, Dr. George W. Holmes, who knows Babism as well as any man, says—"This view is, I believe a correct one, except that it takes no account of the personality of Beha Ullah. What Luther, Cromwell, Washington or Lincoln were to the cause each of these men represented, the person of Beha Ullah is to the religion which bears his name.

"With regard to the alleged wonders, it must be borne in mind that the Persians of to-day are ready to believe the most incredible reports of miraculous performances by dead or living saints, and it is really to the credit of Behaism that it has so few alleged miracles to offer, when it would be so easy to impose a much larger number on the credulity of its votaries."

[1] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. 2.

clude both believers and infidels, while the word Rahim applies only to believers?' I replied, 'Wise men have a rule to the effect that extension of form implies extension of meaning, and Rahman contains one letter more than Rahim.' He answered, 'Either their rule is a mistake or else that tradition which you refer to Ali is a lie.' 'What tradition?' I asked. 'The tradition,' replied he, 'which declares that King of Holiness to have said—"The meanings of all the Sacred Books are in the Koran, and the meanings of the whole Suratu'l Fatiha are in the Bismi'llah, and the whole meaning of the Bismi'llah is in the initial letter B, and the meaning of the B is in the point under the B, and the point is inexplicable."' On hearing him reason thus subtilly, I was speechless with amazement, and led him back to his home. His venerable grandmother came to the door. I said to her, 'I cannot undertake the instruction of this young gentleman,' and told her all that had passed. Addressing him, she said, 'Will you not cease to speak after this fashion? What business have you with such matters? Go and learn your lessons.' 'Very well,' he answered, and came and began to learn his lessons like the other boys. He even began with the alphabet, though I urged him not to do so. One day I saw him talking in a whisper to the boy who sat next him, but when I would have listened, he was silent. Then I pretended to pay no heed to what he was saying, though in reality I listened attentively, and I heard him say to the other boy, 'I am so light that, if I liked, I could fly up beyond the Throne (*i. e.*, the throne of God, situated above the highest heaven); would you like me to go?' So saying, he made a movement from the ground. As he said, 'Would you like me to go?' and made this movement, I smiled in wonder and bewilderment, and as I did so, he suddenly ceased speaking. So likewise, before he had begun to practice writing, I observed that every day he used to bring with him a pen-case, and engage in writing something. I thought to myself, 'He sees the other boys writing, and wishing to write too, draws lines like them and scribbles on the paper.' For several days he continued to act thus, until one day I took the paper from him to see what he was doing. On glancing at it I saw that he had actually written something. Wondering how, without having practiced he could write, I proceeded to examine what he had written, and found it to be a dissertation on the mystery and knowledge of the Divine Unity, written in the finest and most eloquent style, and so profound that the keenest intellect would fail to penetrate its whole meaning. . . . Thus even in his childhood signs of the Bab's holiness, majesty and lofty rank were apparent, so that for instance, as a boy he used to predict of pregnant women whether they would bring forth a male or a female infant, besides foretelling many chance occurrences, such as earthquakes and the ruin of certain places as they actually took place."[1]

It is not strange that such a youth as this was unable to remain contented in business, and before he was twenty-three he journeyed from Bushire to Kerbela, one of the great shrines of the Persian Mohammedans, and studied there under Haji Sayid Kazim, one of the great teachers of the Sheikhie sect, and the immediate and only successor to its founder Sheikh Ahmad. To understand the origin of the Babi movement, its growth and its significance, it is necessary to recall here the religious situation in Persia out of which Babism sprang, and to which it ministers.

---

[1] Browne, *The New History of the Bab*, pp. 263ff.

The Persian Mohammedans are Shiahs, while the rest of the Mohammedan world belongs to the orthodox party called the Sunnis. The enmity between the two sections of the Moslem world is implacable. It arose with the murder of Ali, the fourth caliph, and his two sons, the Shiahs holding that the supreme authority in Islam belongs to Ali and his descendants, and denying the legitimacy of the succession of caliphs recognized by the Sunnis, and, of course, denying the title of the Sultan as head of the Moslem Church. But in another direction the chief point of difference is found—the Shiah doctrine of the Imam. "The Imam is the successor of the Prophet, adorned with all the qualities which he possessed."[1] Ali was the first Imam, and there have been, according to the Imamites, eleven successors. "They are believed to be immaculate, infallible and perfect guides to men. . . . As mediums between God and man, they hold a far higher position than the prophets, for 'the grace of God without their intervention reaches to no created being.'"[2] The Isma'ilians are the other sect of the Shiahs, who differ from the Imamites as to the number but not the character of the Imams, and both sects agree that "there never could be a time when there should be no Imam. 'The earth is never without a living Imam though concealed.' 'He who dies without knowing the Imam, or who is not his disciple, dies ignorant.'"[3]

The last of the Imams according to the orthodox Shiahs, was Abul Kazim (Al-Mahdi), who disappeared just one thousand years ago. The Shiahs believe that in due time he will reappear, that Jesus Himself will be his forerunner, that wrong and wretchedness will then be destroyed, and the Shiah millennium introduced. In the meantime the Imam Mahdi is "invisible and inaccessible to the great mass of his followers." At first, intercourse between the unseen Imam and his people was maintained through a few select intermediaries called Babs or "Gates." This period lasting sixty-nine years, is called the "Lesser Occultation." When the last, the fourth of these Gates, came to die, he was entreated to nominate a successor, as the earlier Gates had done, but refused, saying, "God hath a purpose which He will accomplish." The dreaded catastrophe had come, and intercourse with the Imam was cut off. The dark centuries which followed have been called the "Greater Occultation." The orthodox Shiahs still sit in this darkness. How hopeless it is, in the absence of any Gate to God, one of the great Babi books, the *Beyan*, declares: "For God hath associated refuge in Himself with refuge in His Apostle, and refuge in His Apostle with refuge in His Imams, and refuge in the Imams with refuge in the Gates of the Imams. For refuge in the Apostle is the same as refuge with God, and refuge in the Imams the same as refuge in the Apostle, and refuge in the Gates is identical with refuge in the Imams."

---

[1] Sell, *The Faith of Islam*, p. 78.
[2] Sell, *The Bab and the Babis*, p. 3.
[3] *Ibid*, p. 4.

Devout souls could not be content to sit in such darkness without great longings of heart after fellowship with the living but unseen guide. And his visit to Kerbela brought Mirza Ali Mohammed, a young man of spiritual earnestness and aspiration himself into contact with one of the strongest impulses the Shiahs had yet felt towards a rediscovery of the hidden Imam, and communion with him by some new gate of access. This impulse sprang from Sheikh Ahmad of Ahsa, one of whose scholars was Mirza Ali's teacher, whose testimony to the strange character of his pupil has been quoted, and to whose immediate successor Mirza Ali came to study at Kerbela. Sheikh Ahmad had himself nominated Haji Sayid Kazim as his successor. The doctrines of the Sheikhies, as Ahmad's followers were called, differed from those of orthodox Shiahism. The latter holds that the essential principles, or the "Supports" of religion are five, (1) Belief in the Unity of God, (2) Belief in the Justice of God, (3) Belief in the Prophethood, (4) Belief in the Imamate, (5) Belief in the Resurrection. Of these the Sheikhies accepted the first, third and fourth, and added to these three what they called the "Fourth Support," viz., "That there must always be amongst the Shiahs some one perfect man, capable of serving as a channel of grace between the absent Imam and his Church." The Sheikhies were at first and are now viewed with suspicion by the orthodox Shiahs, although there must be many thousands of them scattered through Persia.[1]

Into this school of thought the young inquirer from Bushire came, and learned in it that there ought to be somewhere the "Fourth Support" of faithful hearts, the Gate of God. In a measure, doubtless, Sheikh Ahmad and Haji Sayid Kazim met this want in their disciples; but when the latter came to die he named no successor, declaring that the time was near when the promised Support would come, the "Master of the Dispensation," asserting that he would be a youth, and that he would not be versed in the learning of men, and as the end drew near he would say, "I see him as the rising sun," "The time of my sojourn in the world has come to an end, and this is my last journey. Why are ye grieved and troubled because of my death? Do ye not then desire that I should go and the True One should appear?"[2]

Mirza Ali Mohammed did not study long under the Sheikhie leader at Kerbela, and had returned to Shiraz before his death. There one of his former fellow-students named Mollah Hosayn, who had been greatly troubled after Sayid Kazim's death, came to visit him. "As I approached the door," said he, "I desired inwardly to tarry there some days. So I knocked at the door. Before he had opened it or seen me, I heard his voice exclaiming, 'Is it you, Mollah Hosayn?'" As the friends sat together and talked over the last words of their revered teacher and the general expectation of the Sheikhies, Mirza Ali Mohammed suddenly astonished his companion by declaring himself to be the promised guide, the way for men to intercourse with Imam Mahdi, the unseen. Mollah Hosayn was incredulous, but as day after day they talked together, Hosayn's faith grew, until at last he says, "I looked up and saw him sitting in a most dignified and majestic attitude, the left hand laid on the left knee, and the right hand over it; and even as I looked, he began to utter most wondrous verses containing answers to every thought which passed through my mind, until seventy or eighty verses had been revealed." Then Hosayn rose to flee in terror, but Mirza Ali restrained him, persuaded his mind, won his heart, and then sent him out, the first missionary of the new faith. The "Proof," the

---

[1] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. 243f.

[2] *Ibid*, p. 239.

"True One," the "Son of Truth," the "Illuminated One had come. The date of the Manifestation and of the first disciple's conversion was May 23, 1844, almost exactly 1,000 years after the end of the Lesser Occultation.

The new teaching at once spread over Persia. The Sheikhies were split by it, one faction going over bodily to Mirza Ali Mohammed, the New Gate or Bab, the religion thence deriving its name. Orthodox Shiahs who believed that the Bab's teaching was a fulfillment of the Koran, mystics to whom the character of the new religion was quite congenial, Persian pantheists, of whom there are legion, some rejoicing in the destruction of morality, which pantheism involves, and men and women who believed the time had come for some reforms which Babism rendered possible, also embraced the new faith; and undoubtedly here and there some hearts must have turned to it in the hope that at last the irrepressible thirst of the human soul was to be satisfied; for what Mirza Ali Mohammed "intended by the term Bab," as the Babi writings say, "was this, that he was the channel of grace from some great Person still behind the veil of glory, who was the possessor of countless and boundless perfections, by whose will he moved, and to the hand of whose love he clung."[1] As the new religion spread it aroused the bitter opposition of the ecclesiastics of the established Church, and the alarm of the Government. Just what the attitude of Babism was towards the Church and State will be seen presently. It is enough to say now that the Church had every reason for desiring to suppress it, and the State theoretically no ground for fear, but practically not a little, if Babism as it later developed, should prevail.[2] The authority of the Mollahs was sufficient, even though Church and State are separate in Persia, to control the action of the civil authorities, and these, on their side, were terrified as all Moslem governments ever will be, at any evidence of free thought or liberal movement among the people. The Babis began at once, accordingly, to feel the enmity of the established order, and were driven in some places to organization for self-defence. Ultimately defeated they would accept the pledged word of the government troops only to be butchered mercilessly when they had given up their arms. Prince Mahdi Kuli Mirza gave assurances of safety to some Babis against whom he was arrayed, and on their surrender smeared 300 of them with naphtha and burned them alive.[1] In 1850 and 1851 the Babis say "more than four thousand of their number were slain, and a great multitude of women and children left without protector or helper, distracted and confounded, were trodden down and destroyed."[2] During the war in Mazandaran, 1,500 Babis were slain. In 1850 seven martyrs were publicly beheaded in Teheran, among them the Bab's uncle. They died with the utmost firmness, refusing to save their lives by any compromise, crying to the people who reviled them on their way to execution, "O people, it is for your awakening and your enlightenment that we have foregone life, warmth, wife and child, and have shut our eyes to the world and its citizens, that perchance ye may be warned and may escape from uncertainty and error, that ye may fall to making inquiry, that ye may recognize the Truth as is meet, and that ye may no longer be veiled therefrom." Haji Mollah Isma'il when entreated to recant, drew himself up and said,

---

[1] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. 3.

[2] With reference to the relation of Babism to the State, the Rev. P. Z. Easton says that he believes it to be equally subversive of State and Church. "Babis follow in the footsteps of their predecessors. The first blood was shed by Babis,—Mollah Mohammed Taki, Kurratu'l-Ayn's uncle, assassinated by Babis in 1848. The haughty tone in letter to Nasr-ed-Din on his accession to the throne broke out in open rebellion. Beha claimed the allegiance of all sovereigns, and placed himself outside of law by assassinating his enemies. His semi-captivity explains why he has not done more of this. As teachers and preachers of assassination, the Babis richly deserve all they have suffered. All past history goes to show that these pantheistic sects are far more merciless and sanguinary than orthodox Moslems." I think this is too severe.

The late Dr. Shedd, of Urumia, in a paper on Babism, read at the Hamadan Conference, in 1894, speaking of the doctrine of the *Beyan*, said:

"There is the strongest assurance given of the ultimate triumph of the new faith. The empires of the future are to be Babi. Church and State are combined, and there is no place for unbelievers, but they are not placed under the hard condition imposed by Islam upon subject races. The central provinces, of the Utopia that floated before the Bab's mind, are in Persia, and each province is given a peculiar place and name. It is a scheme that might satisfy the aspirations of socialism. There is a community of brotherly love; dignity combined with courtesy; leisure with labour; the cultivation of all useful arts and the prohibition of all that is useless; elevation of woman; general elementary education; provision for the poor; strict prohibition of mendicancy and tramps; children to be treated with gentleness, animals with kindness; no persecution for conscience' sake. Such are the leading features of the *Beyan*."

"Behaism," says Dr. Holmes, "certainly does contemplate an earthly dominion which shall eventually subvert all existing governments."

---

[1] Sell, *The Bab and the Babis*, p. 22, quoting Mirza Kazim Beg.

[2] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. 47f.

"O zephyr! Say from me to Isma'il destined for sacrifice,
To return alive from the street of the Friend is not the condition of love."[1]

In 1852 an attempt on the Shah's life made by some Babis was followed by terrible punishments. Twenty-eight victims were tortured and slain. Tow steeped in oil was inserted between their fingers and behind their shoulder blades, leaving portions hanging down which were lighted, and in this condition the unhappy wretches were led, as long as they could walk, through the principal streets of the capital. Some were sawn asunder. "Children and women with lighted candles stuck into the wounds were driven along by whips, and as they went along they sang, 'We come from God, to Him we return.' When the children expired, as many of them did, the executioners threw the corpses beneath the feet of their fathers. Life was offered if they would recant. An executioner told one father that if he did not recant, his two sons, the elder of whom was fourteen years old, should be slain upon his breast. The father, lying down, said that he was ready, and the elder boy claimed by right of birth to be the first to have his throat cut. At last night fell on a mass of shapeless flesh, and the dogs of the suburbs came in troops to the place."[2]

As might have been expected persecutions like these did not extinguish the flame of devotion to the Bab and his doctrine. They but intensified it. "To interfere with matters of the conscience," says the Babi account of these days, "is simply to give them greater currency and strength; the more you strive to extinguish the more will the flame be kindled, more especially in matters of faith and religion, which spread and acquire influence so soon as blood is shed, and strongly affect men's hearts."[3]

---

[1] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. 213.

[2] Gobineau, *Les Religions et les Philosophies dans l'Asie Centrale*, quoted in Sell, *The Bab and the Babis*, p. 31. "It is well," says Dr. Holmes, "while giving the Babi martyrs all the credit they deserve for their constancy in persecution, to remember that their claims to so far surpass Christianity in this respect, are without foundation; that not only when, like Behaism, Christianity was young and full of enthusiasm, it vastly outdid all that the Behais have claimed to do in furnishing martyrs for their faith, but that now, when, if the doctrines of Behaism are true, Christianity ought to be dying or dead, a mere relic of an obsolete phase of Behaism, it has utterly distanced Babism and repeated its earlier performance, in the hecatombs it has offered up in sacrifice for its faith. Instance Madagascar, Armenia, and China. The Behais are constantly boasting of their martyrdoms as a proof of their superiority to present day Christians."

[3] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. 33.

And as Babism spread outwardly, so during these years of trial it developed its significance and claim. The Bab claimed at first to be simply the Gate to the hidden Imam. His earlier works looked forward to the "appearance of that Person," and the Babis themselves, or the great majority of them, now say that he made no claim to the highest forms of revelation at that time. But soon he moved beyond this, and at Tabriz at his examination advanced the claim of Mahdihood.[1] The assembled doctors demanded proof. "Without hesitation he recited texts saying, 'This is the permanent and most mighty proof.' They criticised his grammar. He adduced arguments from the Koran, setting forth therefrom instances of similar infractions of the rules of grammar. So the Assembly broke up."[2] This type of evidence the Bab declared to be quite sufficient to accredit him. As he himself wrote in the *Beyan*, "If any one should reflect on the appearance of this Tree (*i. e.*, the Bab, who repeatedly calls himself the 'Tree of Truth') he will without doubt admit the loftiness of God's religion. For in one from whose life only twenty-four years had passed, who was devoid of those sciences wherein all are learned, who now recites verses after such fashion without thought or hesitation, who in the course of five hours writes a thousand verses of supplication without pause of the pen, who produces commentaries and learned treatises of so high a degree of wisdom and understanding of the Divine Unity that doctors and philosophers confess their inability to comprehend those passages, there is no doubt that all this is from God."[3] But before he came to his end the Bab had gone even beyond this. He became an incarnation[4] of the Primal Will, as

---

[1] According to the Babi view deity is transferable, or it may be imparted gradually or even withdrawn from its one time possessor (*New History*, p. 336f.; Introd., p. xxiii). "Persia never lacks for an incarnation or two. One of these, of the Ali-Allahi sect, arrived in Tabriz some years ago, and made an appointment to visit me at three o'clock in the afternoon. My samovar was set to boiling, and I awaited his arrival. But he failed to keep his engagement because the governor-general, the Amir-i-Nizam, heard of his presence in the city, and this God fled, forgetting to send word that he could not fulfill his engagement" (*Missionary Review of the World*, Feb., 1904, Art. "Babism: A Failure," by the Rev. S. G. Wilson).

[2] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. 20.

[3] *Ibid*, p. 219.

[4] The pantheistic conception of the Incarnation is different from the Christian idea of the God-man. The Behai idea is that God is incarnate in the world all the time, but at the periods of the "Major Manifestation," most of all, which wax and wane in cycles of not less than a thousand years, giving place to the "minor manifestation," then the "occultations" minor and major, etc.

Abraham, Moses, Jesus and Mohammed had done in the Bab's view. This Primal Will is a sort of intermediary between Man and God. "It can be known by man and It knows God; indeed in one sense It is identical with God, wherefore it is said in a tradition, 'Whosoever visiteth Hosayn in his tomb is as one who hath visited God on His throne.' So likewise the Bab said, 'O Ali! None hath known God save I and thou; and none hath known me save God and thou; and none hath known thee save God and I.'"[1]

The Bab did not escape or seek to escape from the lot of suffering which had fallen to his people. He was imprisoned and carried from place to place until on July 9, 1850, he was executed at Tabriz. The accounts of his friends are touched with unnecessary miracle. All the accounts have an Oriental tinge of hyperbole. Mirza Kazim Beg, who did not believe in him, draws a noble picture. "The Bab kept perfectly silent. His pale and beautiful face surrounded by a black beard, his white and delicate hands, his figure and distinguished manner, everything in his person and in his dress aroused the sympathy and compassion of the spectators."[2] The bodies of the Bab and Agha Mohammed Ali, who died with him, were cast out of the city to be devoured by dogs, but friends got possession of them, wrapped them in white silk, placed them in one coffin, and sent them to Teheran.[3] So the Manifestation of God passed away willing to die, as he might have willed not to die, as his followers declared, leaving behind him the memory of a good life, even an unbeliever like Mirza Kazim Beg admitting, "He had some characteristics truly great and noble, and was a man of firm and settled convictions. His moral character was high, and he aimed in his preaching to bring all his countrymen into a community, united by intellectual and moral ties. He spoke with much earnestness on the necessity for a religious and social reform in Persia, the cessation of religious persecution and the amelioration of the lot of women. It is said that much of what he preached on these points had an esoteric meaning, known only to his disciples; but whether this is the case or not, the veneration they felt for him was profound, and there can be no doubt that the teaching of the Bab was in favour of reform."[1] A Western writer goes even further and says: "His wonderful life needs no comment. If ever a life spoke for itself, it is the Bab's, with its simplicity, integrity and unswerving devotion to the Truth that was born in him. Though we of the West may not appreciate many details of his teaching, and though we may fail to be attracted by a faith in which the niceties of language, the mysteries of numbers and the like play so important a part, yet none of us can help admiring the life of the founder of this religion, for in it there is neither flaw nor blemish. He felt the Truth in him, and in the proclamation of that Truth, he moved neither hand nor foot to spare himself, but unflinchingly submitted to all manner of injustice and persecution, and finally, to an ignominious death. That he should have attracted thousands to his cause is perhaps not a matter of such great surprise in a country like Persia, where all are naturally disposed towards religious speculation, and ever ready to examine a 'new thing'; but his influence penetrated deeper than their curiosity and their minds, it reached their hearts and inspired them with a spirit of self-sacrifice, renunciation and devotion as remarkable and as admirable as his own."[2] Among friends and foes alike the Bab has been generally acknowledged to have been a man of unselfish life, upright and true.[3] It is fortunate that so many of the great religious leaders have erred in speculative opinion rather than in personal character or moral doctrine.

---

[1] Browne, *The New History of the Bab*, p. 331.
[2] Quoted in Sell, *The Bab and the Babis*, p. 23.
[3] Browne, *A Year Among the Persians*, p. 64.

---

[1] *Journal Asiatique*, Sixieme Série, tome viii, p. 384, quoted in Sell, *The Bab and the Babis*, p. 27.

[2] Professor Ross, of University College, London, in *North American Review*, April, 1901, Vol. 72, No. 4, pp. 614f.

[3] "An amazing statement!" comments Mr. Easton. "Babism is a form of pantheism, and like all other Persian pantheistic sects, is fundamentally atheistic, anarchistic and immoral. This fact, however, is carefully concealed not only from the outside world, but from the multitude of disciples, 'under the mask,' as Von Hammer says, 'of a more austere creed, and severer morals.' In the case of the Assassins seventy years elapsed before the true character of the sect was known. The true doctrine is known only to the adepts, among whom the Bab himself must be classed. The Bab planned to exclude all unbelievers from five of the chief provinces of Persia, and, save in the case of merchants and others following a useful profession, from all lands in which the Babi faith prevailed (*New History* p. xxvi). It was during his life that the doctrine of the community of women was broached at the Badasht Conference. That he was a weak man is shown by the way in which he allowed himself to be eclipsed by Mirza Moli Ali of Mazandaran. In his death he compares unfavourably, as regards courage,

Babism did not die with the Bab. It entered upon new development. After the Bab's death, Bagdad became the headquarters of the movement, and the head of the community was Mirza Yahya, who had been fourth in order in the organization of the new faith, but was now first through the death of the two who stood between him and the Bab. Mirza Yahya is better known by the title Subh-i-Ezel, or "Dawn of Eternity." In 1853 an elder half-brother of his, named Beha, joined the community in Bagdad. Beha recognized the supremacy of Subh-i-Ezel, who preserved a comparative seclusion of life, leaving the work of direction and correspondence to Beha. The Persian Government objecting to the continuance of the Babi propaganda at Bagdad, so near the Persian borders, the Turkish Government removed the exiles first to Constantinople, and then in 1864 to Adrianople. Here there was a rupture between the brothers, Beha usurping the place of leadership which by direct assignment of the Bab and by long recognition during fourteen years had belonged to Subh-i-Ezel. Because of the dissensions which at once developed between the factions of the brothers, and also because of the detection of fresh attempts at propagandism, the Turkish Government separated the parties, and removed Beha to Acre and Subh-i-Ezel to Famagusta in Cyprus, sending, however, some Behais as Beha's faction have come to be called, with Subh-i-Ezel, and some Ezelis, or followers of the latter, to Acre. This schism has never been healed. The great majority of the Babis, however, nineteen-twentieths probably, are followers of Beha.

Beha not only gained the support of the Babis as a whole. He also advanced beyond the Bab in his claims, and completely interpreted away much of the supposed glory of the Bab. The writings of the sect indicate this process.[1] *The New History* is full of the Bab and declarations of his greatness. The later book, *A Travel-*

---

with Babek, who, 'when his hands and feet were struck off, by order of the caliph, laughed, and smilingly sealed with his blood the criminal gaiety of his tenets'" (Von Hammer, *History of the Assassins*, p. 27).

[1] In his paper on "Babism—Its Doctrines and Relations to Mission Work," read at the Hamadan Conference in 1894 and published in *The Missionary Review of the World*, December, 1894, the late Dr. Shedd writes of the Babi books:

"The writings of the Bab are said to number more than a hundred treatises, including many thousand stanzas of poetry.

"The books that specially claim attention are:

"1. *Ziyaret Name*, written before he claimed to be the Bab. It gives instruc-

ler's Narrative which Browne has issued, as *The Episode of the Bab* sets the Bab in the background, and exalts Beha to the first place. "It was then (*i. e.*, at first) supposed," says the later book, "that he (*i. e.*, the Bab) claimed to be the medium of grace from His Highness, the Lord of the Age (upon him be peace); but after-

tions as to the mode of worship at the shrines. Besides this, it is the expression of an ardent enthusiast who pours out his longings for the Imam Mahdi. 'Where are the days of your empire that I may struggle for you? Where are the days of your glory that I may obtain the blessing of seeing your face? Where are the days of your Kingdom that I may take revenge for you on your enemies? Where are the days of your manifestation that I may be free from all except thee (absorbed in thee)?' etc. The young man soon believes that he has the special favour and fellowship of the Imams.

"2. A commentary or treatise on the Sura of the Koran called Joseph, written in Shiraz. In this Ali Mohammed declares himself to be inspired, to be the Bab. He does not renounce Islam, but claims that a true knowledge of Islam must come through the Bab. He says that God has placed within his grasp the kingdoms of heaven and earth. He presents himself as a prophet, and appeals to the book he is writing as proof of prophetic inspiration, that he is able to write hour after hour, composing the most exalted verses by the thousand and on the most exalted themes, the Divine being and attributes. He also directs his followers to rules of life very different from Moslem practice. Divorce and smoking are forbidden. The food of Jews and Christians is counted pure, etc.

"3. *The Beyan* or *Exposition* written in Maku. It is the ultimate doctrine of the Bab. His title now is Nukhta U'la, first point, or Nukhta i Beyan, point of revelation or exposition. A positive system of doctrine and precept is set forth. The doctrine of God is explained at length. The essence of God has existed from all eternity in unapproachable glory and purity. No one has known it as it should be known. No one has praised it as it should be praised. From it has proceeded creation, which has no beginning and which shall have no end that we can express. Eternal in duration, the creation is subordinate in causation, is the emanation of the Divine Essence. As the Divine Essence is beyond our knowledge, the primal will has incarnated itself from time to time to suit the understanding of mankind. These incarnations are the prophets, an unknown number in the past, and it speaks now through the Nukhta—*i. e.*, the Bab, and will speak again through 'him whom God shall manifest.' The primal will is like the sun, which rises and sets, but is in reality the same sun, not a different sun to-day from the sun of yesterday. So each prophet is a new day or manifestation of the same essence, the undivided unit of being. The evidence of a prophet is not miracles so much as the efficiency of his words. 'When God wishes to create anything, He says "Be" and it is. The word of a prophet has the same quality: what he says comes to pass. Mohammed said, "Make a pilgrimage to Mecca," and each year brings thousands flocking thither. He said "Fast in Ramazan," and millions obey him year by year. The word of the Nukhta is as powerful to change and construction as the word of Mohammed.'

"The doctrine that no revelation is final is strongly enforced. One great mistake of Christians and Moslems, it is alleged, has been this, that there is no more to follow. Each prophet is fitted to reveal the primal will for a time, to be followed by another with a fuller utterance. In the childhood of the race, all truth was taught by parables and figures. Good is shown to be pleasant and evil, bitter in their results by comparisons. Good men after death are to enter beautitul gardens with all possible delights. The wicked are to enter the torments of conwards it became known and evident that his meaning was the Gatehood of another city, and the mediumship of the graces of another person whose qualities and attributes were contained in his books and treatises."[1] Until Beha arose the Babis undoubtedly did regard the Bab as the medium of grace from His Highness, "the Lord of the

suming fire. But the world has now reached a stage when the true meaning of paradise and hell can be disclosed. Paradise is the joy of belief in the manifestation of God and attaining the perfection of one's being. The perfection of a thing is its paradise. Hell is unbelief and the state of imperfection which it imposes.

"The doctrine as to the future life is obscure and transcendental. The worship of God is to be freed from all hope of reward. Perfection will follow, but how this perfection is reached, whether by stages of transmigration or by absorption in the primal good or in some other way, is not made plain. It is certain that the Bab and his followers had no fear of death. They went to martyrdom singing and exulting, but it is hard to see what it was sustained them in such trials. It was allegiance to the Bab, but just what hopes did he offer them that gave them exultation in death? It was not the hope of the Christian martyr nor the Paradise of Islam, but rather a pantheistic disregard of life.

"In the *Beyan*, the prophecy is prevalent of another to follow the Bab, called 'Him whom God shall manifest.' The ordinances and precepts of the new faith all have reference to this coming personage, and prayers are offered that he may not suffer as the Bab suffered. There is a humility and self-renunciation displayed, which reminds one of John the Baptist as the forerunner of Christ.

"The whole round of religious duties is changed to suit a new calendar. A cabalistic power is given to the Arabic letters somewhat after the teaching of Sheikh Ahmad. The chapters of the *Beyan* are in groups of nineteen, and this is made the sacred number. Alif stands for one. The Arabic name for one is Vahid. The numerical values of the letters in Vahid make the sum nineteen, and several other formulas are worked out to the same result. The number 1 denotes the uncreated and unknowable essence of God, and this one added to the sum of the letter of Hayz (the living) gives the sacred number 19. Multiply 19 by 19 and 361 is the result, which again equals the Arabic formula for all things plus the initial one. The Bab is the point, the initial one, and eighteen of his followers are made apostles to complete the sacred number. The year has nineteen months of nineteen days each, with four days thrown in, just before the vernal equinox, as feast days. Chronology and religion are readjusted on this plan. . . .

"4. Another work is ascribed to the Bab called the *Seven Proofs*, afterwards enlarged by Beha and called *Ikan* or 'Assurance.' It is the only book of the Babis which they have printed. The copies are brought from India, not for public sale, but kept in the hands of leading men to be given to inquirers as may be safe for a proscribed religion. Mr. Browne has given the line of argument as follows. After stating the doctrines of God as to His essence, of His Creation, and of the prophets or manifestations of the primal will, a passage is quoted from the Koran in which Mohammed says: 'As to the prophets, I (am they),'—that is, Mohammed was the same in essence as the preceding incarnations of the primal will.

"In each manifestation, word was given of the following one. The Jews were told to expect a Messiah, but when He came as Jesus, they rejected Him, because they had all imagined His coming in a different way. So the followers

---

[1] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. 7.

Age (upon him be peace)," but the very grounds on which they believed this made them ready to receive and acknowledge the claims of Beha to succeed and supersede the Bab, who now came to be called His Highness the Evangelist, and to be regarded as sustaining to Beha the relation of John the Baptist to Christ. And both by and

---

of Christ were told to expect His return; yet when he returned as Mohammed, they failed to recognize him, and are to this day expecting His coming. So the Mohammedans are expecting the coming of Imam Mahdi, yet when he has come, they refuse to recognize him, because the manner of his coming does not correspond with their own vain imaginings of how he ought to come.

"Then he says to the Moslems: 'You blame the Jews because they did not accept Christ as the promised Messiah. You also condemn the Christians because they did not recognize Mohammed as the promised comforter or paraclete,' although Christ had clearly said, 'One shall come after Me whose name is Ahmad.'"

(These words are based on the promise of Christ as to the Comforter, the Paraclete. For this word the Moslems would substitute Periklutos, which corresponds in meaning with Ahmad or Mohammed, *i. e.*, praised, lauded.)

"The prodigies expected at the return of the promised one are explained figuratively. By the sun, for example, is meant the primal will manifesting itself in the prophet of the age; by the moon and stars are meant his companions and the teachers of his religion. The end of the world is the manifestation when the cycle is completed, and the sun shall be darkened and the stars shall fall from heaven—that is, the last manifestation is abrogated, the last sacred book is closed, the priests or mollahs who expounded this book fall from their high places, because the new revelation is given. This is the meaning of the verse in the Koran, 'when the sun shall be folded up and the stars shall fall,' and of similar passages.

"Now the Moslems blame the Jews and Christians, yet act in precisely the same way themselves, urging as a reason for not accepting the new manifestation that the expected signs of the Imam's coming have not appeared.

"Then follows an argument to prove that the claims of the Bab are as strong as those of Mohammed as to style of composition and power and excellence of doctrine. The line of reasoning is very strong and convincing in the view of the Babis, and its cogency is felt by the Moslems. Few of the latter are ready to meet a Babi missionary in fair discussion. The same line of argument adopted is used in dealing with Jews, Christians or Zoroastrians. The new faith is broad enough to include Zoroaster among the prophets, for his words were words of power to his followers.

"After the death of the Bab in 1850, there are no extant writings of importance, till 1865 the announcement of Beha was made claiming to be the one whom God shall manifest. He had expanded the *Seven Proofs* into the *Ikan* before this, but there is no positive proof of it. After this, he became a very voluminous writer of epistles to his followers in Persia. He became in their eyes and claimed to be, the incarnation of the Deity, the Lord of the attributes or centre of the revelation of the Divine Essence, perfect in humanity, the One whom God shall manifest, Christ and the Paraclete returned, God the Father in short, the fullness of God manifest in the flesh. He also identified himself with previous prophets, especially with the Bab, that he himself suffered in Tabriz, and his spirit returned to the supreme associate.

"Besides these epistles to his followers, he addressed to kings and rulers various documents. His appeal to the Shah of Persia in behalf of toleration for

for Beha more has been claimed than was ever claimed for the Bab. Mr. Kheiralla in his recent book, declares it to be his purpose to prove "that the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, has appeared in the human form as Beha Ullah, and established His Kingdom upon earth."[1] And Mr. Phelps speaks with a smaller measure of definiteness but in a note characteristically Behaistic: "It was necessary for the Essence Itself of God to become manifest, and this It did through the person of Beha Ullah. This is not saying that Beha Ullah was not a man like other men; for all manifestations are men like other men; but he was also, and as a man, the crowning glory of a period, in whom the perfect Divine Image was reflected.

"Now that Beha Ullah, the man, is no more, the drop has become the ocean. That which was manifested is withdrawn to God, the pure Essence—to that which is both Spirit and its Source.

"'All religions,' says Abbas Effendi, 'are written symbolically. This is the only way in which Truth can be written to withstand time and its changes. Languages change, the meaning of words is lost; for these are but the expressions of periods. Symbols never change, since they are the expression of men's spirit. The realities encased in them are handed down as long as the symbols are preserved. These realities, the spirit reawakens.'"[2]

It is difficult to conceive of a man living in these times and sus-

---

his followers is a well-reasoned and cogent plea. He sent letters to the Grand Vizier of the Sultan, to the Pope, to Napoleon III, to the Emperor of Russia, and to Queen Victoria. For some reason, he was displeased with the Emperor of Germany, and ventured to predict that dire calamities will fall upon the capital beyond the Rhine.

"The only systematic work is called *The Most Holy Tablet.* This prescribes more fully the rules of the new religion, but adds no new doctrine to the system of Bab. The times of prayers and of fasts and feasts are given, places of worship are to have no images or pictures, the dead are to be buried with much ceremonial pomp, pilgrimages are few, very elaborate rules for inheritance are laid down, slavery forbidden, the civilization of the West enjoined in many particulars, the kings of the earth are exhorted. The claim is made that the treatise is not one of scientific production, it is beyond the power of science, the revelation of God Himself, and hence, above all criticism.

"For one whose pretensions are so superlative, the performance is very meagre. There is no transcendent excellence apparent to mark the advance of revelation. Possibly if the Son of God had not appeared in Jesus Christ, and become the Alpha and Omega of human hopes and salvation, such a system might become another 'Light of Asia,' but since Christ has come, the same yesterday, to-day and forever, there can be no comparison between Babism and Christianity."

[1] Kheiralla, *Beha Ullah, the Glory of God.*

[2] Phelps, *Abbas Effendi*, p. 149f.

taining the weight of such claims in his behalf, but all who saw Beha Ullah during his life agree that he bore himself with dignity and commanded respect. Mr. Browne who visited him at Acre in 1890, says of that experience: "The face of him on whom I gazed I can never forget, though I cannot describe it. Those piercing eyes seemed to read one's very soul; power and authority sat on that ample brow; while the deep lines on the forehead and face implied an age which the jet black hair and beard flowing down in indistinguishable luxuriance almost to the waist, seemed to belie. No need to ask in whose presence I stood, as I bowed myself before one who is the object of a devotion and love which kings might envy and emperors sigh for in vain! A mild, dignified voice bade me be seated, and then continued: 'Praise be to God that thou hast attained.' . . . Thou hast come to see a prisoner and exile. . . . We desire but the good of the world and the happiness of the nations; yet they deem us a stirrer up of strife and sedition worthy of bondage and banishment. . . . That all nations should become one in faith and all men as brothers; that the bonds of affection and unity between the sons of men should be strengthened; that diversity of religion should cease, and differences of race be annulled—what harm is there in this? Yet so it shall be; these fruitless strifes, these ruinous wars, shall pass away; and the 'Most Great Peace' shall come. . . . Do not you in Europe need this also? Is not this that which Christ foretold? Yet do we see your kings and rulers lavishing their treasures more freely on means for the destruction of the human race than on that which would conduce to the happiness of mankind. . . . These strifes and this bloodshed and discord must cease, and all men be as one kindred and one family. . . . Let not a man glory in this, that he loves his country; let him rather glory in this, that he loves his kind."[1]

It is hard to believe that such a personage should indulge in the claims Mr. Kheiralla makes for him, and that are both made and acknowledged by thousands of the faithful, who regard him, as Professor Ross says, "as God Almighty Himself," or it would be hard to believe this if it were not for the fact that Behaism specifically denies the personality of God. Mr. Phelps in his book, which he tells us was submitted to Abbas Effendi and approved by him, unequivocally sets forth this position. God is an essence, not a person. The terms of Beha's letter to the Shah of Persia must be interpreted thus, even though he seems to speak of God as distinct from himself in the sharpest language: "That Real King is in Himself sufficient unto Himself and independent of all; neither doth any advantage accrue to Him from the love of contingent beings, nor doth any hurt befall Him from their hatred. All earthly places appear through Him, and unto Him return, and God singly and alone abideth in His own place, which is both above space and time, mention and utterance, sign, description and definition, height and depth. And none knoweth this save Him and whosoever hath knowledge of the Book. There is no God but Him, the Mighty, the Bountiful."[1]

---

[1] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. xxxixf. But see for a more matter of fact representation the account of Dr. Jessup's interview reprinted, with the kind permission of *The Outlook*, on pp. 174–180 of this volume.

Such recognition of the separate personality of God, one of the great truths of Islam, is only apparent and is buried in Babi thought under indefinite, mystical forms.[2] "Thus Kumeyl ibn Ziyad, one of Ali's chosen disciples, once demanded of his Master, behind whom he was seated on a dromedary, 'What is Truth?'" This story is cited in the Bab's *Seven Proofs* and is made much of by the Babis. "'What hast thou to do with the Truth?' answered Ali, 'for verily it is one of God's mysteries and a jewel out of His treasure house.' Then said Kumeyl when Ali had spoken for some time after this fashion, 'O my Master, am I not worthy to share thy secret?' 'Yes,' answered Ali, 'but the matter is a great one.' 'O my Master,' said Kumeyl, 'dost thou desire those who beg at the door of thy bounty to be turned away?' 'Nay, verily!' answered Ali, 'I will answer the call of such as are troubled, and will sprinkle upon thee somewhat of the overflowing fullness of the station of the

---

[1] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. 115f.

[2] "The Behai conception of the Supreme Being is not a personality, but an Essence, an all-pervading Force or Power, frequently referred to as Love, or Truth, or Life. 'God,' says Abbas Effendi, 'is pure essence and cannot be said to be anywhere or in any place.' God is infinite, and, as terms are finite, the nature of God cannot be expressed in terms. But as man must form and express a conception of God in some way, he calls God 'Love,' or 'Truth,' because these are the highest things he knows. Life is eternal; so man, to express God's infinity, says that God is 'Life.' But these things in themselves are not God. God is the source of all things that are made, and all things that are, are mirrors reflecting His Glory" (Phelps, *Abbas Effendi*, p. 114).

Truth. Receive it from me according to thy capacity and conceal it from such as are unworthy to share it. O Kumeyl, the Truth is the revelation of the splendours of Divine Majesty without a sign.' 'O my Master,' said Kumeyl, 'I understand not thy meaning. Explain it to me further.' 'The effacement of the conjectured and the learning of the known,' answered Ali. 'Explain more fully,' demanded Kumeyl. 'The rending of the veil by the triumph of the mystery,' answered Ali. 'O my beloved Master,' rejoined Kumeyl, 'tell me more.' 'The attraction of the Divine Unity through the nature of the apprehension of its oneness,' added Ali. 'Tell me more clearly,' repeated Kumeyl. Then said Ali, 'A light shining forth from the Morning of Eternity and irradiating the temples of the Unity.'"[1] The story ends here, and I suspect Kumeyl gave it up at this point. And it is impossible to read the Babi books without feeling this atmosphere of Oriental imagery and speculation, and without becoming conscious of the vapours of the old Sufi pantheism which for centuries has tinged the thoughts of the Mohammedans of Persia, to such an extent that one historian declares that "the whole country has been so undermined by this insidious heresy that it can almost be said that Persia throughout its extent contains no real Moslem."[2] The Bab had little external connection with the Sufis or mystics,[3] but this doctrine of the Primal Will manifested in chosen men is practically the same as the Primal element of the Sufi, a divine emanation, from which proceeds all manifestation of the divine essence.[1] It is in this atmosphere that the Bab and Beha have conceived their relations to God, and not in terms of our Western conception of personality, and save when Babism is being presented apologetically in the West, it falls back into its setting in the indefinite mystical dreamings and outreachings of the Persian mind.

---

[1] Browne, *The New History*, p. 329.

[2] Haines, *Islam as a Missionary Religion*, p. 76.

[3] "Sufiism," says Browne, "by reason of that quietism, eclecticism and latitudinarianism which are amongst its most characteristic features, is the very antithesis, in many ways, to such definite doctrines as the Manichæan, the Isma'ili and others, and would be more justly described as an indefinite immobility than as a definite movement. This point is often overlooked and even scholars—especially such as have never visited the East—often speak of such sects as the Isma'ilis or the Babis of to-day as though they were akin to the Sufis, whereas a great hostility usually exists between them, the natural antagonism between dogmatism and eclecticism. The Babis in particular equal their Shiite foes in their hatred of the Sufis, whose point of view is quite incompatible with the exclusive claims of a positive and dogmatic creed" (Browne, *A Literary History of Persia*, p. 422f.).

One of the last things that can be said about Babism, however, in the form which it has taken under Abbas Effendi, its present head, is that it is a "positive and dogmatic creed." Mr. Phelps' authorized representation of it (Phelps, *Abbas Effendi*) makes it a loose mystical eclecticism. An "indefinite mobility" would be an apt description.

"Though with sword in hand my Darling stand, with intent to slay, though I sinless be,
If it pleases him, this tyrant's whim, I am well content with his tyranny.
The country of 'I' and 'We' forsake; thy home in annihilation make,
Since fearing not this step to take, thou shalt gain the highest felicity."

That bit of Sufi poetry is by one of the most famous characters of Babism, Kurratu'l Ayn, a woman of whom we shall say more presently. It is as truly Sufi as this outcropping Sufiism in the sceptic Omar Khayam:

"There was a Door to which I found no Key;
There was a Veil past which I could not see;
Some little talk awhile of *Me* and *Thee*
There seem'd—and then no more of *Thee* and *Me*."

It was this mystical answer of Babism and later of Behaism to the craving of the human soul for some intercourse with God, the unseen God, which undoubtedly accounts for some of its power. "Its principles," as the Babis claimed, "are the withdrawal of veils, the verification of signs, the education of souls, the reformation of characters, the purification of hearts, and illumination with the gleams of enlightenment."[2] And it lays especial emphasis on spiritual discernment, on freedom from "slavishly following literalist devices,"[3] and on the unfailing presence in the world of "silent manifestations of the Spirit, intrinsically not less perfect than the speaking manifestations whom we call prophets."[4] "The gales of the All-glorious passed by me," said Beha to the King of Persia, "and taught me the knowledge of what hath been. . . . This is a leaf which the breezes of the Will of thy Lord the Mighty, the Extolled, have stirred."[5]

---

[1] Sell, *The Bab and the Babis*, p. 36.
[2] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. 156.
[3] Browne, *The New History*, p. 236.
[4] Browne, *A Year Among the Persians*, p. 327.
[5] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. 395.

While this esoteric pantheism of Babism has been one secret of its strength, its accompaniment, an absolutely unlimited allegorizing, is to our Western minds one of its weaknesses. The Mohammedan doctors at once objected to its method of dealing with the Koran, and to its metaphorizing away the prodigies and signs which were to usher in the advent of the Imam Mahdi.[1] "The Mohammedan doctrines of the examination of the dead in the graves, the Resurrection, Sirat, Heaven, Hell, are all treated allegorically" by the Babis.[2] And the Babis are difficult people to discuss religion with because words may or may not mean to them what they mean to others. "These people," writes one of the missionaries in Persia, "find grist in whatever comes to their mill, being the extremest of literalists when it suits their purpose, and outdoing the father of the allegorists when that method suits their purpose better."[3] It is doubtless this mystical, allegorical character of Babism that attracts a certain type of mind in America, in the main, probably, the same type which follows after spiritualism, esoteric Buddhism, Swamis from India, theosophy, and other movements which play around the edges of the occult and the magical, and help to dull the edge of present realities with the things that are neither present nor real.

But Babism in Persia under the Bab and under Beha embraced real and practical elements, and was full of worthy teaching. "As for those who commit sin and cling to the world, they are assuredly not of the people of Beha."[4] "What is well pleasing is that the cities of men's hearts which are under the dominion of the hosts of selfishness and lust, should be subdued by the sword of the Word, of Wisdom and of Exhortation. Every one, then, who desireth 'victory' must first subdue the city of his own heart with the sword of spiritual truth and of the Word, and must protect it from remembering aught beside God."[5] "No stranger must find his way into the city of the heart, so that the Incomparable Friend (*i. e.*, God) may come into

---

[1] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. 25.

[2] Sell, *The Bab and the Babis*, p. 42.

[3] "I had a very interesting visit from some of the Babis of this place (Ilkachee), who spoke very freely of their faith and seemed very firm in it. They quote Scripture, but spiritualize everything that does not suit their tenets, and so finally make language mean anything and nothing" (From a letter from Miss Grettie Y. Holliday, Tabriz, Persia).

[4] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. 70.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 114f.

His own place—that is, the effulgence of His names and authority, not His essence, for that Peerless King hath been and will be holy for everlasting above ascent or descent."[1] "O saints of God," cried Beha, "at the end of our discourse we enjoin on you once again chastity, faithfulness, godliness, sincerity and purity. Lay aside the evil and adopt the good. Regard the horizon of uprightness and be quiet, severed and free from what is beside this. There is no strength and no power save in God."[2] Among the injunctions of the new religion as set forth by the Bab and Beha, were purity of life, freedom of conscience, cessation of religious warfare, friendship and intercourse between races and religions, the abdication of that curse of Mohammedan lands, mendicancy; "the most hateful of mankind before God," it is declared, "is he who sits and begs; take hold of the robe of means, relying on God, the Cause of causes;" enemies were to be forgiven and evil not to be met with evil; rulers were to be obeyed, and the laws observed; confession of sin to fellow men was prohibited. All must learn some trade or follow some occupation, and pilgrimages were no longer necessary. Opium and wine are forbidden, the injunction of the Koran against the use of wine being notoriously disregarded in Moslem lands. The Bab even forbade the use of tobacco, but Beha has released the pressure here. Surely these are worthy precepts, and the religion that can lead men to practice them, if Babism can do this, will render a useful service to those men who embrace it.

And the Babi movement is distinctly a sign of life and progress. Such a superb personal devotion as has been displayed by their followers towards both the Bab and Beha is itself a worthy thing which we should expect to uplift character and accomplish good. In this devotion they have cheerfully met death in the most terrible forms. Even if there have been those who turned back, as in the case of thirty-one who decided that it was not their duty to avoid saving their lives by renunciation when the Seven Martyrs died in Teheran in 1850,[3] there have yet been thousands who gave to their faith the good testimony of martyrs' deaths. If it is a beautiful thing to die for one's country, it is not less beautiful to die for one's friend and one's faith;

---

[1] Sell, *The Bab and the Babis*, pp. 45f.

[2] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. 81.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 213.

and it must be admitted and without reluctance, that at least by their death the Babis of Persia have borne witness in support of the contention of that historian of this religion who declares "that the fundamental intentions and ideas of their sect were things spiritual, and such as are connected with pure hearts; that their true and essential principles were to reform the morals and to beautify the conduct of the human race."[1]

On the other hand, the zeal of Babism turned almost immediately to the use of the weapons of its persecutors. It was unlike the early Christian Church in the Roman Empire in this, though not unlike the early Christian Church in some other lands. Not content with defending itself in open battle when assailed, it resorted to the tactics of assassination and torture.[2] And when later the two factions of the Babis arose, some of the Ezelis who were sent to Acre with Beha from Adrianople were murdered by Beha's followers, and Beha "regarded the event with some complaisance," while his son, the present head of the religion, interceded for the murderers. When summoned to court to testify in the case, Beha was asked who and what he was, and replied, "I will begin by telling you who I am not. I am not a camel-driver (alluding to Mohammed), nor am I the son of a carpenter (alluding to Christ). This is as much as I can tell you to-day. If you will now let me retire, I will tell you to-morrow who I am." "Upon this promise," says Mr. Oliphant, "he was let go; but the morrow never came. With an enormous bribe, he had in the interval purchased an exemption from all further attendance at court."[3] And some call the man who did this the Everlasting Father. How long will they be able to save his moral teaching if bribery is divine, and assassination allowable? And we must press questions like these against such claims of Deity, even in the face of Mr. Browne's defence: "The idea of secret assassination is so repugnant to us and so incompatible with our notions of virtue and moral rectitude, that we naturally shrink from imputing it without the clearest evidence to a man or a body of men of whose character and qualities we have otherwise formed a high opinion. But in

---

[1] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. 66.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 36, 181, 198.

[3] Oliphant, *Haifa*, pp. 209, 210. This story is contradicted in Phelps, *Abbas Effendi*, p. 75f.

Asia where human life is held cheap and religious fervour runs high, a different standard of morality prevails in this matter; and we must beware of being unduly influenced in our judgment by our own sentiments."[1]

The moral possibility of combining with a religion like Babism elements of evil like assassination may be laid to the Oriental character or it might not improperly be charged in part to the influence of Mohammedanism. The Prophet was his own moral law, and the life and rights of men were trifles in the way of his purposes. The historic and racial relationship of Babism to Islam brought the same idea into the new religion. Mr. Brown reports a Babi Sayid in Shiraz to have said in answer to some remark of his about the bloodshed caused by Mohammed and his followers, "Surely you cannot pretend to deny that a prophet, who is an incarnation of the Universal Intelligence, has as much right to remove any one whom he perceives to be an enemy to religion and a danger to the welfare of mankind, as a surgeon has to amputate a gangrened limb!" To charge the burden of such views on Babism and the Bab would be, however, as wrong as to charge the Inquisition upon Christianity and Christ. And although Babism does show in this and much else, the powerful influence of Islam, it represents, as has been already pointed out,—and herein lies a part of its significance to the missionary movement,—a radical departure from the old faith. The ecclesiastics in Persia acted on a sure instinct when they denounced it, and urged the State to annihilate it, for in simple terms it was, as Sell says, "a religious revolt against orthodox Islam, so far as that is represented by the Shiah sect."[2] It was even more hostile to the Sunni system. "It was probably in the Holy City itself," Professor Ross says, that the Bab on his one pilgrimage thither, "once and for all freed himself from the Prophet's Faith, and conceived the thought of 'ruining this faith, in order to establish in its place something altogether differing from it.'"[3] In *The New History*, however, the Bab is said to have gone to Mecca to proclaim his religion there. At any rate, on returning to

---

[1] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. 373. This would be just enough in the case of a man but we cannot tolerate iniquity in God or in one claiming to be God and we cannot conceive of God incarnate subject to the limitations of racial moral ideal.

[2] Sell, *The Bab and the Babis*, p. 50.

[3] *North American Review*, April, 1901, p. 600.

Shiraz, he made an alteration in the Azan, or call to prayer used by the Moslem world, inserting the words "I bear witness that Ali Mohammed His Servant is the remnant of God," and the Muezzin so uttered the call from the mosque near the Bab's house and was arrested, punished and expelled from the city on this account.[1] This one presumptuous blasphemy, as it seemed to faithful Moslems, illustrates how radical the breach was.

The new religion cut across the whole field of Mohammedan opinion and practice. Moslem law makes the pilgrimage obligatory. He who denies that this is an obvious duty enjoined by the Koran, which says, "The pilgrimage to the temple is a service due to God from those who are able to journey thither,"[2] is considered to be an infidel.[3] Babism abrogated the pilgrimage. The Moslems regard the Koran as absolutely inviolate, and final, divinely inspired without human admixture. "Mohammed's idea was that it should be a complete and final code of directions in every matter for all mankind."[4] The Bab produced a new Koran, and as he claimed a better one. At first he merely asserted that his Koran was as good as Mohammed's. "Then the Lord of the world thus revealed: 'That Word is by the tongue of Mohammed the Apostle of God, and this is my Word by the tongue of the Person of the Seven Letters, the Gate of God.'" But soon he advanced beyond this. When under arrest at Shiraz, the governor suggested that he should demonstrate that his doctrines were superior to those of Mohammed. The Bab answered, "Take my Koran, compare it with that of your prophet, and you will be convinced that my religion is the preferable one."[5] The Bab, furthermore, flatly contradicted the Mohammedan idea, advanced by Mohammed himself, that Islam was a final revelation. "They are to remember," he said, "that no revelation is final, but only represents the measure of truth which the state of human progress has rendered mankind capable of receiving." The world comes to revelation in other words, rather than revelation to the world. The Mollahs truly denounced this as departure from orthodox opinion: "This person, without regarding the fact that he is at variance with the Perspicuous

---

[1] Browne, *The New History*, p. 200f.

[2] *Sura* iii, 91.

[3] Sell, *The Faith of Islam* p. 223.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

[5] Sell, *The Bab and the Babis*, p. 15.

Religion, is a meddler with custom and creed, and a troubler of kings and emperors. Therefore to eradicate, subdue, repress, and repel this sect is one of the requirements of the Well-established Path (*i. e.*, the religion of Islam), and indeed the chief of obligations."[1] And again they exclaim, "What an evidently false assertion is this! By God, this is a thing to break the back! O people, extinguish this fire and forget these words! Alas! woe to our Faith, woe to our Law!"[2]

One very practical evidence of the difference between the new religion and the old was at once presented in its attitude towards the place and rights of woman. Islam made a fatal mistake in this matter. It condemned one-half of society, and the half on which most depends in the shaping of a nation's character, to lives worse than simple slavery because of necessity so full of the conditions which develop what is basest in life and pollute it at its springs. "Even those of us who have spent long years in this country," writes an experienced and temperate missionary in Persia, "are constantly receiving new and shocking revelations of the corruption, indecency and insecurity of their family life."[3] Travellers or other apologists for Islam who gloss over its degradation of woman, simply do not know what they are talking about. As against all this, the Bab and Beha "enjoined the disuse of the veil, the abolition of divorce, polygamy and concubinage, in other words, of the harem; and greater liberty of action for the female sex."[4] The Koran allowed both polygamy and concubinage and practically unlimited divorce. Babism provided that if quarrels arose between husband and wife, he was not at once to divorce her, but to wait a year in the hope of reconciliation. This aspect of the religion naturally made powerful appeal to women, and Mirza Kazim Beg attributes its extraordinary spread to the zeal of women among others in its propagation.[5] The most famous of these was Kurratu'l-Ayn, or Lustre of the Eye, some of whose verses have been already quoted as illustrating the Sufi mysticism in Babism. She was a daughter of a learned mollah of Kazvin, and was early converted to Babism. For a while she lived at Kerbela, and gave addresses to the Sheikhies. This displeased the governor, and she removed to Bagdad, then to Kermanshah and Hamadan. Some Babis disapproved of a woman's preaching, but the Bab supported her, and called her "Her Excellency the Pure." She moved from place to place exerting everywhere a great influence by her eloquence, her wisdom, and her high character. As the Babis say, "She discussed and disputed with the doctors and sages, and loosed her tongue to establish her doctrine. Such fame did she acquire that most people who were scholars or sages sought to hear her speak, and were eager to become acquainted with her powers of speculation and deduction. She had a brain full of tumultuous ideas, and thoughts vehement and restless. . . . In short, in elocution she was the calamity of the age, and in ratiocination the trouble of the world."[1] She was executed at last in Teheran in the persecution which followed the attempt upon the life of the Shah. As Mr. Browne says, "The appearance of such a woman as Kurratu'l-Ayn is in any country and any age a rare phenomenon, but in such a country as Persia it is a prodigy—nay, almost a miracle. Alike in virtue of her marvellous beauty, her rare intellectual gifts, her fervid eloquence, her fearless devotion and her glorious martyrdom, she stands forth incomparable and immortal amidst her countrywomen. Had the Babi religion no other claim to greatness, this was sufficient—that it produced a heroine like Kurratu'l-Ayn."[2] Kurratu'l-Ayn had had an unfortunate marriage experience of her own, and she preached to a nation of women who had drunk from the same cup. I heard a missionary once explain to a curious group of Moslem women in a Persian village, the teaching of Christianity, and the customs of Christians regarding women. They listened with wonder, and exclaimed together, "That is the religion for us, may we be its sacrifice!" The Babi women missionaries had this deep longing

---

[1] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. 106.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

[3] Miss Holliday of Tabriz, in *Woman's Work for Woman*, August, 1901, p. 221.

[4] Curzon, *Persia*, Vol. I, p. 502.

[5] On the Doctrine of Babism as to the position of woman, Mr. Easton comments, too adversely I think: "'The ordinances of the religion of the Kaim (*i. e.*, the Bab) are the ordinances of unity; all goods are his goods; all men are his servants; and all women his handmaidens, whom he giveth to whomsoever he pleaseth.' 'A tradition . . . that His Holiness will change wives and husbands' (*The New History*, p. 358). Kurratu'l-Ayn was not a model

---

woman. Gifted but vile. Not free from suspicion in the case of the assassination of her uncle. Belongs to the same order of women as Aspasia, Catherine II, and Madame De Pompadour."

[1] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. 31.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 309.

and discontent to appeal to. "Her speeches," says Mirza Kazim, speaking of Kurratu'l-Ayn, "stigmatized that gross tyranny which for so many centuries had imprisoned liberty. She preached not, as some have said, to abolish the laws of modesty, but to sustain the cause of liberty. The eloquent words which fell from her mouth captivated the hearts of her hearers, who became enthusiastic in her praise;" and who, it may be added, turned to a religion which could do for women what it had done for her. At the same time it must be admitted that there is a touch of oriental luxury of admiration in some of these estimates of Kurratu'l-Ayn, who in important moral characteristics did not rise above the level of her time and place. And in its results Babism has not exalted woman.[1]

The Babis attacked the motives exalted in the Koran. "So worship God," wrote the Bab, "that if the recompense of thy worship of Him were to be the fire,[2] no alteration in thy worship of Him would be produced. If you worship from fear, that is unworthy of the threshold of the holiness of God, nor will you be accounted a believer; so also if your gaze is on Paradise, and if you worship in hope of that; for then, you have made God's creation a partner with Him." This was far removed from the sensual eschatology of the Prophet of seven wives. And most bitterly of all, the Babis attacked the ecclesiastics of the established religion. They denounced them for their self-interest, their injustice, their greed for gain, their bartering of religion for gold and silver, their pride and love of human glory, accused them of being devoid of the very rudiments of wisdom, knowing no method but conjecture and imagination, full of irrational belief, absurd traditions and the grossest ignorance.[1] They charged them with being responsible for the stagnation and decay of Persia, of preventing the introduction of railways, of opposing the study of Western sciences, and speculating in food supplies in times of famine, and letting people starve that their grain might await a higher market price. "Shame on the people of Persia for their lack of spirit!" they exclaimed. "By God, they have not a spark of patriotic or manly feeling; they have grown habituated to cowardice, falsehood and flattery; they acquiesce in tyranny and oppression, and relinquishing the position of free agents, have become mere passive instruments in the hands of the clergy." While these clergy "think themselves entitled to set their feet on the necks of all mankind. They become dead men's heirs, consumers of endowments, and collectors of tithes and 'thirds.' And usurp the station of 'the One, the Dominant,' 'to whom belongeth dominion.'" Well says Hafiz:

---

[1] "Let us pass to the test question of how Babism treats women. It is not great praise to say that in this there is an advance on Mohammedanism, though it is far behind Christianity. I have seen no evidence that Babi doctrine teaches communism of wives. Incidents leading to this conclusion may doubtless be credited to the sinners among the Babis. Babism forbids temporary marriage and concubinage and polygamy, which are allowed by Shiahs. It allows bigamy, however.

"Beha had two wives at one time, by each of which he had children. When Abbas' mother died, he again joined a 'partner' to his remaining wife, thus being a bigamist twice over. The 'branches' (brothers) who are now quarrelling are from different mothers. Marriage among Behais is on a low Oriental plane. Divorce is allowed at the option of the husband, even for frivolous causes, such as a quarrel. The parties are recommended not to marry inside of a year, that, if possible, their hearts may be reconciled. The dowry of the divorced wife is a mere pittance of nineteen miscals of gold (about $50) in the city, and nineteen miscals of silver ($2) in villages. If the husband leaves home and neglects to send word or means of support to his wife for *one* year, she is free to marry another man. Early marriages are discountenanced.

"Women are secluded in the harems and from the society of men, as among ordinary Moslems. The historic case of Kurratu'l-Ayn, of Kazvin, is a solitary exception. She has had no successors. Even she ordinarily delivered her lectures from behind a screen, and only occasionally let her veil fall aside in the presence of men when carried away by her enthusiasm. Behais do not seem to approve of her conduct. Several Behai families with whom I am acquainted are allowing their daughters to grow up without learning to read, though the fathers are teachers and are educating their sons" (*Missionary Review of the World*, February, 1904, Art. "Babism: A Failure," by the Rev. S. G. Wilson).

[2] "The phraseology, the symbols and the pantheistic conceptions of the Sufis are constantly cropping out in Bahai literature as well as in their conversation," says Dr. Holmes. "This teaching of the Bab is an expression of a familiar sentiment of the Sufis. Thus Attar quotes Rabi'a al-Adawiyya as praying, 'O God! If I worship Thee for fear of Hell, send me to Hell; and if I worship Thee in

> "These preachers who, when in their pulpits, of virtue
> make such a display,
> Behave, I assure you, in private in quite a dissimilar way,

---

hopes of Paradise, withhold Paradise from me; but if I worship Thee for Thine own sake, then withhold not from me the Divine Beauty' (Browne, *Literary History of Persia*, p. 426).

"There is also the familiar story of Al-Hallaj, (or was it Al-Ghazzali?) who went about with a pitcher of water and a torch, and when asked what he intended doing said, 'I am going to quench Hell fire, and burn up Heaven.'

"The Behais disclaim all affiliation with the Sufis, and yet theirs is but a modified form of the same pantheistic creed."

[1] Browne, *The New History*, pp. 76, 77, 175.

> That they put any faith in the judgment they preach
> one can scarcely believe,
> When Him who shall judge them they daily attempt to
> outwit and deceive."

"O people of the earth," said the Bab, "give thanks to God, for verily we have delivered you from the doctors of doubt."[1]

Not content with thus pillorying the ecclesiastics of Islam, the Babis, upon the death of the Bab, cursed the people of Islam, too,[2] and even prior to the Bab's murder had renounced Mohammed himself. The Seven Martyrs of Teheran "received an offer of pardon, on condition of reciting the Kelema or creed, that Mohammed is the Prophet of God. It was rejected, and these missionaries," says Lady Shiel, "died stedfast in their faith."[3]

The time for such a revolt from Islam as this had fully come. It was demanded by the sterility and immobility of the old faith. Men erroneously credit to Mohammedanism the science and philosophy which the Saracens kept alive during the dark ages of Europe; but as G. H. Lewes says, "All the Philosophy and Science of the Mohammedans was Greek, Jewish and Persian."[4] For four centuries the contest between the movements of life and thought and the rigidity and stolid conservatism of Islam was waged, and the "great effort to bring it into accordance with the main stream of human thought, to introduce into it some element of progress utterly failed. The lesson is plain. . . . Revolution not reform is the only hope."[5] And while in a sense Babism was a reform, in a truer sense it was a revolution. It deliberately denied the fundamental principle of the finality of Islam. In doing this it made way for progress, for liberty, for life; but it also affronted the dominant faith from which it sprang. Innovation in the Moslem view "is worse than a mistake. It is a crime, a sin. This completeness, this finality of his system of religion and polity is the very pride and glory of a true Moslem. To look for an increase of light in the knowledge of his relation to God and the unseen world, in the laws which regulate Islam on earth, is to admit that Mohammed's revelation was incomplete, and that admission no Moslem will make."[1] This seemed to the Shiah ecclesiastics a sufficient answer to make to the Babis. "This person's disagreement with the most luminous law," said the doctors of Ispahan, "is clearer than the sun, therefore the best possible thing is to put in practice the sentence of the law."[2] There was no room in Islam for a man with a forward gaze. The golden age was past, and life was to be chained to it forever. Babism broke with the past.

---

[1] Browne, *The New History*, pp. 76, 77, 175, 181ff.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 307.
[3] *Life and Manners in Persia*, pp. 180, 181.
[4] *History of Philosophy*, Vol. II, p, 34.
[5] Sell, *The Faith of Islam*, p. 186.

This attitude of Babism is of course the very foundation assumption of Christian missions in a Moslem land, or in any land. Among Mohammedans, to be sure, Christianity calls men back from their Prophet six centuries to Christ, but it does this only to point out that Christ's religion is totally different from theirs, and superior to theirs in that while it has historic antecedents, it is a religion of life, of human movement under a Divine Spirit, of hope and perpetual advancement. Babism has rendered the real service of dealing a powerful blow at the bondage of orthodox Mohammedan opinion in Persia.

It has rendered another great service in its plea for toleration and liberty of conscience. It professes to deny the unity of Church and State, which is another fundamental Mohammedan conviction, but a conviction nevertheless, which is ineffective in Persia. In matter of fact, however, the Persian Government, though independent of the Moslem Church, is powerfully influenced by it, and the Bab, though in reality a religious teacher, was killed by the State. The experience which the Babis gained of the evil of State support of religion doubtless sharpened their original opinions on the question of religious toleration.

The Babi movement was not a political movement. It certainly did aim at the reformation of abuses, but this was by the improvement of individual character. If the Bab felt himself "appointed of heaven to regenerate his country," it was not by political means that he felt called to do it, but by the inward working of a great spirit of quickening and transformation. His followers were enjoined to obey their rulers and submit to the laws. "The persecution of the Government very early drove the adherents of the new creed into an attitude of rebellion; and in the exasperation produced by the struggle and by the ferocious brutality with which the rights of conquest were exercised by the victors, it was not surprising if fanatical hands were found ready to strike the sovereign down," and to destroy those who, the Babis felt, were but tools in the hands of the ecclesiastics. But Beha himself denied all responsibility for the attempt upon the Shah's life, and although the movement might have become political if it had triumphed or may yet become so if it controls the majority in Persia, we may accept as sincere, under existing conditions and while they last, the disavowals of its leaders and believe "that with things material they had absolutely no concern." It is further indication of their feelings, though not to be taken wholly without qualification, that the Babis exculpate the Shah himself from blame for their persecutions, and acknowledge just treatment from many officials, but accuse chiefly those governors and ministers who through fanaticism or fear lent themselves to execute the will of the Church.[1]

---

[1] Sell, *The Faith of Islam*, p. 24.

[2] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. 12.

The very fact that it had no political designs and concerned itself only with "things connected with pure hearts," and yet suffered so from persecution led, as has been said, to a peculiar emphasis on the rights of men to religious liberty. The Babis point out to their persecutors that the best way to make a movement harmless is to let it alone. "Up to the present moment," they said, "of movements pertaining to religion many have appeared in the countries of Europe but non-interference and absence of bigotry having deprived them of importance, in a little while they became effaced and dispelled." [2] "Interference is not destruction, but edification when thou regardest the truth, which will not, thereby become quenched and forgotten, but rather stimulated and advertised." [3] But apart from this, Beha constantly declared that men had a right to be free in conscience and belief. "A just government," he said, "can find no excuse and possesses no pretext for further persecuting this sect except a claim to the right of interference in thought and conscience, which are the private possessions of the heart and soul." [4] And he appeals to the example of Great Britain and her progress, points out that the times are changed, and that principles and institutions have under-gone alteration, and that "government should no longer persecute this one or that one or disturb itself about the ideas and consciences of its subjects and people. All are the subjects of the King, and are under the shadow of the royal protection." This was very different from the old Mohammedan spirit. "Him who changes his religion," says the Moslem Tradition as declared by Imams Malik, Shafa'i and Hanbal, "kill." "From its first appearance," wrote Mirza Kazim Beg in 1866, "the teaching of the Bab has been distinguished from all other reforms which have hitherto been produced in Persia or the East generally, by a well marked aspiration towards truth and towards liberty of conscience."

---

[1] Browne, *The New History*, p. 189; *The Episode of the Bab*, p. xlv.
[2] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. 49.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 67.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 157.

Even though the views of Babism have not been accepted in Persia, it is certainly true that their dissemination has influenced the Persian character, already much more tolerant than the Turkish, and has made a wider preaching of Christianity through the country increasingly practicable. "Everywhere in our field," writes a missionary from Tabriz, "the Moslems seem in a restless state of mind, and are seeking for some remedy in a religious change. The sect of Babis are making large gains in the rural districts. All their leaders are enlightened men intellectually at least. I hope they may prepare the way for religious freedom in Persia."[1] Where the Babis prevail there is a spirit of hospitality and toleration towards Christians unless they are forced to cover over these natural feelings in order to avoid the enmity and escape the suspicion of their Moslem neighbours.[2] "Consort with people of all religions with spirituality and fragrance," Beha bade his followers. "Beware lest the zeal of ignorance possesses you amongst mankind. All originated from God and returneth unto Him; verily He is the Source of Creation and the Goal of the worlds."[1] And in their dealings with others in propagating their faith, the Babis were forbidden to use violence. "Show forth that which ye have; if it be accepted the object is attained; if not, interference is vain; leave him to himself, while advancing towards God, the Protecting, the Self-subsistent."[2]

---

[1] Letter from the Rev. J. N. Wright, D. D., June 24, 1901.

[2] "We fear the Babis will get hold of some of our young men. Many of the Jews in Teheran have become Babis, and some of our Moslem friends we believe to be such—but as they allow the denial of their faith, one cannot believe them. It is difficult to make any impression on them. Perhaps the greatest advantage to be expected from them is in their demand for religious toleration" (Letter from the Rev. J. L. Potter, D. D., of Teheran, Sept. 9, 1901).

"I do think that the Babis are doing a work in preparing the people for religious inquiry and their existence testifies to a longing after God and a deep dissatisfaction with Islam. Their history, full of error though it may be, is extremely touching to me, and in this last false Christ, though he may be produced by Satan, we see 'imitation is the sincerest flattery,' and the enemy has tried his best to present a suffering Christ, such a counterfeit as can only be detected when compared with the genuine coin" (Letter from Miss Grettie Y. Holliday of Tabriz, January 11, 1902).

The question which the knowledge of this movement first suggests to us, namely, Has not a religion so full of good teaching, so hopeful in its rupture with Islam, done much to prepare the way for Christianity? may then be answered by saying, "Yes, it has done a great deal. It has weakened the foundations in Persia of the most intolerant and immobile faith which has ever held the wills of men. It has preached freedom of conscience and brotherly charity, and the effect of this preaching has been real even upon those who have not accepted the religion which produced it. It has spoken a word for woman, and so hinted at least of what is to be found in greater fullness in Christianity. It has held up higher moral standards than Islam's. It has shown that Persians are ready to die for a religious faith whose essential character is spiritual even though mystical, and which does not draw men by the promise of spoils and sensuality here, or visions of bright-eyed houris in the paradise beyond. Some would add that it has introduced and made room for larger and freer conceptions of God, conceptions dangerous and untrue often, but in advance of the mechanical, dominant Deity of Islam, who "is the only Agent, the only Force, the only Act existing throughout the universe, and leaves to all beings else, matter or spirit, instinct or intelligence, physical or moral, nothing but pure unconditional passiveness, alike in movement or in quiescence, in action or in capacity."[3] But to this Dr. Holmes replies, "I would not be prepared to admit that pantheism gives room for a larger conception of God than even the narrowest monotheistic faith. Islam has been saturated with these pantheistic conceptions, at least in Persia, for ages, but it has wrought no regeneration in the life, either of individuals or of the nation. But the presence in the midst of the Persians of a Deliverer, who claims divine power with which to carry into ultimate execution a scheme of reform so largely based on the principles of the Gospel of Christ,—an idea such as this, whether or not its premises are true, must have an enormous quickening power, and cannot fail to stir men's minds to action for a time, in spite of an utterly false conception of God, a conception, I believe, far more hurtful in itself than that of the Koran."

---

[1] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. 151f.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 153.

[3] Palgrave, *Arabia*, I, p. 309.

Babism has refused to acknowledge that humanity's one end is to be bound in the chains of the Arabian institutions and ideas of the seventh century. It has taught that God,—albeit He is not the Christian God and the Babis do not call Him Father—has a mind towards men, and has not left and will not leave Himself without a witness among them. The Rev. James W. Hawkes of Hamadan, has called attention to the fact that only Moslems and Jews have attached themselves to Babism. None of the members of the Syrian or Gregorian Churches in Persia have done so, for the reason, he feels, that Babism has had nothing to offer even to these decayed Christian Churches. Their members have already, even in their present degeneracy, as much spiritual freedom as Babism offers, and as has proved so attractive to those bound under the burden of Islam and Judaism. Mr. Hawkes states that his observation leads him to regard the strength of Babism as lying in its offer of some freedom coupled with its compromise with old forms which the believer can maintain though disbelieving in them, and thus save himself from annoyance or persecution.

It should be added that Babism has rendered a service which scarcely needed to be rendered, but which is not without its use. It has shown once more that Mohammedanism is utterly unadaptive. Hinduism absorbs the movements that grow up in hostility to it or revolt against it. Christian doctrine has embraced school after school of thought that has arisen; but Islam is unbending, incapable of expanse. Behaism teaches to-day what all the centuries have taught since Mohammed arose, that there is death for man in Islam but not life, and that all who believe in a living world must work and pray for the release from the throats of all Moslems of the stiffened clutch of the hands of the dead Prophet, "the great Arabian."

But not all has been said when we have pointed out the service rendered to Christian missions by the religion of the Bab and Beha. There is a balance on the other side. For Babism is not so much a preparation for Christianity as a supersession of it. It knows of Christ and supplants Him. It has weighed His claims and seeks to advance stronger ones.[1]

Of course the Bab himself knew as much of the Christian Scriptures and the Christian religion as he would learn from the Koran, and although that information is very unsatisfactory, it is considerable. But he knew more than this. At Shiraz he had opportunities for intercourse with Jews, and "through Protestant missionary translations he became acquainted with the Gospels."[2] And the influence of his acquaintance with Christianity is evident both in his own words and in what is related of his life. Thus he is reported to have healed a child with a diseased head by drawing a handkerchief over it.[3] He was transfigured before his followers, although a muleteer who was along observed nothing.[4] He anticipated martyrdom "that all may know the extent of my patience, and contentment and self-sacrifice in the way of God."[5] And he said to his companion in death, "Verily Mohammed Ali shall be with us in Paradise." It was said of him by his disciples that the prophecy of the signs which should mark the appearance of the Imam Mahdi were fulfilled in him—"In him shall be the perfection of Moses, the preciousness of Jesus and the patience of Job,"[6] and again of those who would not seek the truth in the Bab,

> "The physician of Love hath the healing breath of
> Christ, and is prone to heal,
> But how can He undertake the cure of a pain
> Which thou dost not feel."[7]

---

[1] See the paper by Dr. Geo. W. Holmes, formerly of Persia, printed on pp. 169–174.

[2] *North American Review*, April, 1901, p. 608.

"Garabed has been able to be out in the villages and small towns most of the time and has had some good work. He has met with Babis who at first welcomed him gladly but when he preached, refused to have anything more to do with him. 'We supposed you were come to build us up, but you tear us down; we have no use for you and your Gospel.' Babism is spreading rapidly; they work like beavers both day and night and boast of their zeal and sacrifice. I think the elements which give it strength are all stolen from Christianity" (Letter from Miss Grettie Y. Holliday of Tabriz, March 7, 1902).

[3] Browne, *The New History*, p. 221.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 207.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 235.

[6] Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. 259.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 106.

And not only did the Babis know of Christianity, but they got their doctrine by a long inheritance from the early Christian heresies. "I trace their doctrines back," says Dr. Holmes lately of Hamadan, who knows the actual views of the Persian Behais as well as any man, "through the Druses, the Ansairiyeh or Nusairiyeh, and the Assassins to the Hakemites (the followers of the Fatimite Caliph of Egypt, Hakem B'amr Ullah), to the Isma'ilis, and thence back to the Gnostics, Neo-Platonists, etc."[1] And Mirza Kazim Beg says of the Bab in summing up his reflections, "We neither consider him as an adventurer nor a fanatic, but an eminently moral man, a dreamer brought up in the school of the Sheikhies, and possessing some touch of Christianity." It is possible, too, as Haines suggests, that the Sufi influences which shaped Babism run back to some contact with Christianity.[2] The idea of the Primal Will intermediate between God and man, which the Babis got from the Sufis, the Sufis in their turn had got from the Gnostic notion of the æons emanating from the Incomprehensible and Ineffable God.

But the relations of Babism to Christianity go far beyond this. The new religion claims to include and supersede the old.[3] According to the Behais there have been seven manifestations of the Primal Will, Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Christ, Mohammed and Beha, and each manifestation has revealed more of the godhead than his predecessor, Beha, revealing the Father Himself, being the supreme and final one, the mystery of God referred to in Revelation 10 : 7. In this the Behais, have gone beyond the original teaching of the Bab, and in reality have made out of Babism a new religion, the first and absolute requirement of which is faith in Beha as God.

---

[1] Browne suggests the heredity of some of the Bab's ideas and also their occultation in the latest development of the faith:

"These ultra Shiite sects, then, which we have now to consider, and which under the leadership of Sinbadh the Magian, al-Muqunna, 'the Veiled Prophet of Khurasan,' Babak, and others, caused such a commotion in Persia during this period, do but reassert, like the later Isma'ilis, Batinis, Carmathians, Assassins, and Hurufis, the same essential doctrines of Anthropomorphism, Incarnation, Re-incarnation or 'Return,' and Metempsychosis; which doctrines appear to be endemic in Persia, and always ready to become epidemic under a suitable stimulus. In our own days they appeared again in the Babi movement, of which especially in its earlier form (A. D. 1844–1852) they constituted the essential kernel; though in later time, under the guidance of Beha Ullah (A. D. 1892) and now of his son 'Abbas Effendi, The Most Great Branch' (who appears to be regarded by his followers as a 'Return' of Jesus Christ, and is so considered by the now fairly numerous adherents of this doctrine in America) they have been relegated to a subordinate, or at least a less conspicuous position. The resemblance between these numerous sects, whose history can be clearly traced through the last eleven centuries and a half, is most remarkable and extends even to minute details of terminology, and to the choice of particular colours (especially red and white) as badges. Thus the early Babis like the Mubayyida of the period now under discussion, wore white apparel, while they imitated the Muhammira in their fondness for red by their choice of ink of that colour in transcribing their books" (Browne, *A Literary History of Persia*, p. 311f.).

[2] Haines, *Islam as a Missionary Religion*, p. 75.

[3] "One summer morning last year, at Lake Hopatcong, N. J., one of the children returned to the cottage exclaiming, 'O papa, there is a man here who wants to see you, he has a religion from Persia.' I accordingly went over to

the man's place of business, and found a German, who actually professed to be a Babi. His knowledge of the Persian religion was not extensive, but his enthusiasm was abundant, and he declared that though the religion was so new, they already had thirty million followers ! Last winter while I was in Kazvin, the Babis received a letter from the United States, telling of the success of their missionary operations in America ; at which they rejoiced greatly.

"Last week one of this sect requested permission to call and talk with us on their religion. We sent around for him to come and see us, thinking to get acquainted, and make an appointment for the discussion. Thereupon a young man came and from 5 until 10 o'clock P. M., talked a stream of parables and figurative illustrations in exposition of their religion. It takes in all the '124,000 prophets,' accepts equally the sacred books of the Jews, Christians, Moslems and the Bab. When properly understood they all agree. The sun sets and it rises again. It is the same sun—Moses set and Christ rose—Christ set and Mohammedan rose—Mohammedan set and the Bab rose. They are all one, though they appear in a different garb. The rose-bush goes to sleep in the autumn ; we gather the rose leaves, and preserve somewhat of their fragrance ; but in the spring the bush revives and we have a fresh rose. When we fail to see that it is the same rose, it is because we do not understand aright. On one occasion a Babi opened his discussion with the question : 'Who understood the Old Testament better, the Jews, or the Christians ?' To which I replied the Christians, for we understand the spiritual meaning of the Old Testament. The next question was : 'Who then understand the New Testament better, the Christians or the Moslems ?' He was quite put out because I would by no means admit that, by parity of reason, the Moslems, because of their later book had the advantage of us.

"The young man, only an artisan (maker of glazed tiles), was so full of talk, that we could hardly get a chance to say anything. We, however, insisted that in the later book there was an absolute contradiction of the death of Jesus, which is one of the central doctrines of Christianity, but he would not admit that there was such a verse in the Koran. He said he was only an ordinary workman, and requested permission to bring one of their leaders to see us and talk with us, so we set a time.

"On the day appointed the young man and the leader came, but more than an hour late, for which they apologized. This shortened the time for the allotted conference, and it was mutually agreed that each side should have half the time. We had thought out a line of discussion. They usually begin with a series of examples to show that the language of Scripture is figurative, and thus to firmly establish a foundation upon which to base their free use of this means to explain away anything that seems to be against their views. They commonly claim that it takes a whole series of meetings to show the correctness of their faith.

"On this occasion, we asked their leader to kindly explain to us their interpretation of certain passages relating to the second coming of Christ, which

As his followers say "Beha is Christ returned again."[1] "Christ returns to you as Beha with angels, with clouds, with the sound of trumpets. His angels are His messengers, the clouds are the doubts which prevent your recognizing Him; the sound of the trumpets is the sound of the proclamation which you now hear."[2]

This allegorical interpretation of the signs which were to accompany Christ's return, betrays the whole Behai method, and illustrates the difficulty met in endeavouring to present historical Christianity to them. Every manifestation of God, such as Beha claimed to be, is the final authority in interpreting the texts of the Koran, the Babi books and the Scriptures relating to himself. "He therefore," says

---

according to their position must have been fulfilled by the coming of Mohammed, *e. g.*, 1 Thess. 4: 14–17. He forthwith launched out in a long talk to show how the Jews understood their Old Testament. Once or twice we tried to call him back to the point before us, but he only approached it near enough to say that clouds, according to figurative usage, mean darkness and obscurity. Finding it impossible to bring him to a definite and concise statement of their interpretation of this one first passage proposed, we gave up the attempt, and let him run on his own way for half an hour. Then we asked him to please state briefly what benefits and blessings his religion offers over and above what we already enjoy in Christianity and how such benefits and blessings are to be obtained. These questions seemed to take him somewhat by surprise, and after some irrelevant remarks about the Jews, he wanted to know what benefit we had in religion that the Jews do not have? He did once come near enough to the point to say, that the benefits of their religion can only be understood by those who have accepted it. His time being up we claimed ours" (Letter from the Rev. J. L. Potter, D. D., of Teheran, Sept., 1901).

[1] As its followers have learned more of Christianity and Western thought, they have modified its statements increasingly and borrowed more and more of Christian tone and statement. The development of Beha's thought is doubtless due not a little to the influence of Christianity (*Public Opinion*, February 21, 1901; Browne, *The Episode of the Bab*, p. xxxvi). Cf. *The New History* and *The Traveller's Narrative*, the latter written under the influence of Beha, the former before his time. The latter gives the Bab a far less important place, is free from the miracles and extravagances of the former, and shows the pruning and adaptation which development rendered inevitable.

[2] Browne, *A Year Among the Persians*, p. 38. "What the Behais believe about the future life is a puzzle. I have asked several men who have known the Behai manifestations, and who have read their revelations, and one said: 'In the last analysis they reject the future life.' Another said: 'They believe in the transmigration of souls.' A fervent Behai of the old school said: 'We believe in a future state so unthinkably ecstatic that if its joys were now revealed to men they would commit suicide to hasten their entrance into it.' The subject remains obscure to European investigators. After twenty years of questioning them, I believe they have no definite teachings on the subject. Some believe in a future paradise, others in 'rijat,' or return, to earth as men. Certain it is, however, that they reject the doctrine of the resurrection of the body and of the judgment" (*Missionary Review of the World*, February, 1904, Art. "Babism: A Failure," by the Rev. S. G. Wilson).

Dr. Holmes, "has only to disclose a given text as referring to himself, and then to give its exegesis. This is often directly at variance with its apparent meaning, but this only displays more clearly the divine insight of their teacher, that he is able to recognize and appreciate words no one else can understand." And the Rev. J. L. Potter, D. D., of Teheran, writes of some recent experiences in the city of Kazvin, "At one time there seemed a bright prospect of reaching the Babis, but the expectation was not realized. They seem in some respects to present a more hopeful field for mission labour than the Moslems, because of their ready acceptance of the Scriptures and certain Christian doctrines rejected by the Mohammedans. On the other hand, however, their fanciful interpretation of plain Scripture declarations renders it very difficult to make any impression on them by proof texts from the Bible whose authority they readily admit. They reply, 'Yes, but we must break open the word and extract its meaning.' Their hospitality, zeal, and earnestness in the propagation of their belief are worthy of praise and emulation; but their easy dissimulation of their faith, even to openly cursing the Babis, and the unreliability of their promises, are discouraging."

This wide-spread dissembling of their faith among Babis is intelligible, but its influences are disastrous. It was the easiest way to escape from unrelenting persecution. So Beha issued a dispensation allowing it. In consequence it is often impossible to discover who are Behais in Persia.[1] Yet this legality of deception is not new. It was an old Shiah doctrine, and it has eaten into the very vitals of the Persian people. "With such phrases as 'I compromise,' 'I agree,' which have now become universal technicalities, do they defame God and man, trampling under foot the rights of their fellows, and shutting their eyes to equity and justice."[2] The Shiah system of religious reservation and compromise, or "takia," furnished the atmosphere in which Babism has had to live, and it is not strange that it has been affected by it from the beginning,[1] however nobly many tempted men and women rose above it. Indeed the Babis relate that a third man was to have been slain with the Bab and Mohammed Ali, but recanted in accordance with a command of the Bab, "the object of this command being the preservation of the words and writings of the Bab." Later, two years after this deliverance, Sayid Hosayn, whose opinion had never changed, met a martyr's death in Teheran. The Bab's character has suffered under this idea of the legality of deception and falsehood. And indeed there could be no more fatal point than this in the collapse of a religion. Truth, absolute truth, is the first thing, and that Babism has surrendered. There are fewer martyrdoms now because there are more liars. A system of justified compromise and deceit cannot be a satisfactory preparation for Christianity, though it is better than Shiah Mohammedanism, which has the vice of legal compromise minus the virtues of Babism. These aspects of Babism are of course suppressed in the American version.

---

[1] "The month which I passed in Akka," says Mr. Phelps, "was the Mohammedan fast of Ramazan, which, as all other Mohammedan observances, was scrupulously kept by Abbas Effendi and his followers, for the sake of peace, and to avoid the reputation of social innovation" (Phelps, *Abbas Effendi*, p. 101).

Mr. Phelps says that the Behais in Acre confine their small school to boys. "Girls are excluded by Mohammedan custom" (*Ibid*, p. 110). These easy adaptations to conditions condemned in principle but adopted "for the sake of peace" is thoroughly characteristic. Indeed it is probably this soft compliance with anything and the absence of the robustness of definite truth and solid principle which make Babism attractive to many moral softlings in the West.

[2] Browne, *The New History*, p. 10.

This radical defect and the essential claim of Behaism to supersede Christianity constitute vital difficulties in the way of the conversion of the Babis to Christianity. At the same time the movement represents a real advance over Shiahism, and an approach to Christianity. "They seem to correspond," writes one of the missionaries, "to the Brahma Samaj of India, in trying to hold on to their old faith while drawing largely on the Bible for their teachings. At the same time it makes one sad to see them approach so near the truth in many respects, and yet miss it."[2] And another missionary who travels constantly over the country says:

---

[1] A missionary writes from a city in Persia, "I have had somewhat more opportunity to visit and receive Mussulmans in the city than for some years past. With one man of wealth who is related to mollahs I have exchanged four visits. He has long known the Gospel, and was greatly impressed with one of our missionaries he met years ago on a Black Sea steamer. He says he believes in Protestantism as the best religion, and that half the city would profess it were there liberty. (Here use the salt cellar.) He also desired me to write to our mujtahids or theological authorities, to get a legal decision, that it was lawful for him to be a Christian, without professing the faith publicly, 'for that will mean to us,' he said, 'confiscation of my property and death.' How far does Christianity allow takia?"

[2] "At Assadabad," writes Miss Annie Montgomery of Hamadan, regarding a missionary tour to Kermanshah, "it seemed as if not any women except those of

"Babis are found everywhere. They are zealous in propagating their faith and are increasing in numbers. In Mianduab, they enjoy considerable freedom and are now asking permission from the Government to build for themselves a house for worship. Because of the strength of Babism, there is unusual freedom for preaching the Gospel in Mianduab. Our evangelists could preach openly in the bazaars without molestation. The Babis told our evangelists that they were grateful to us for spreading the Gospel among Mohammedans for it aided their cause. They said that the preaching of the Gospel to Mohammedans resulted in making Babis of them and that it was through the reading of our Scriptures that they themselves became Babis. That is, Babism is the result of the influence of Christianity on Islam. I think there is a measure of truth in this. It is Christianity breaking down Islam. But it is too long a step from Islam to Christianity so they come part way and accept Babism. I am not hopeless concerning the Babis. They misinterpret Scripture and are self-conceited, telling us that we do not understand our own Scriptures. But they are out of the rut of Islam and there is some hope of their moving in the right direction. It is no longer unlawful for them to search our Scriptures and they are reading them though it be only to seek proofs for their preconceptions."

It will be interesting to watch the future of the Babi movement. Before Beha died at Acre in 1892, he said, "Whosoever lays claim to a matter (*i. e.*, a mission) ere one thousand full years have passed, verily he is a lying impostor." Upon his death his eldest son, Abbas Effendi, became the spiritual head of the Behais, and he is now regarded by the vast majority of the Behais, in spite of his father's words, with the same veneration accorded to his father. He did not succeed without rivalry to his father's place, and one of his brothers withdrew into retirement, unable to approve of his course. Mr. Phelps in his book, *Abbas Effendi*, presents a different view. He says that Beha had chosen Abbas Effendi as his successor and that there is no fraternal disagreement. It was this Abbas Effendi regarding whom Mrs. Hearst, of California, after visiting him declared her faith in writing, "I believe with all my heart and soul that he is the Master, and I hope that all who call themselves be-

the household, were coming near us; so I started out to look for my hearers. I had not gone far when a woman came running after me and saying, 'Do you not know that one of your people is living here?' And she rushed out and insisted on my going into her house. Her husband and several women came in, and I found she was a woman who had heard the Gospel. I had an hour of reading and prayer with them, though in spite of their profession of being Christians I fear they are all Behais." This incident is proof of much that has been said. Babism had made these people friendly to Christianity, and given them a feeling of kinship to it.

lievers will concede to him all the greatness, all the glory, for surely he is the Son of God."[1] The other faction of Babis, represented for a time here in America, by Mr. Kheiralla, holds that Beha Ullah is the only one who should be worshipped. There are now, accordingly, various factions, the largest by far being followers of Abbas Effendi, "Our Lord," as Mr. Arthur P. Dodge, the founder of the *New England Magazine*, and a Behai convert, calls him.[2]

---

[1] New York *Sun*, quoted in *Public Opinion*, February 21, 1901.

[2] In reply to a recent request for information as to the progress and character of Behaism in America, Mr. Dodge writes telling where meetings were at the time held in New York City, and saying in addition:

"First, permit me to say, Babism was so-called after the holy personage known as The Bab (signifying Gate or Door), who came as the forerunner of the Greatest Manifestation of God ever given to the world, in like manner as came John the Baptist to prepare the way for the coming of Jesus Christ. The Bab appeared and began his work of announcing the coming of Him whom God shall manifest, in 1844. In 1852, this great and bold manifestation of God was first proclaimed in the personage of Beha Ullah (Glory be to him!) the mission of the Bab having terminated, hence Behaism. The whole grand work is in fulfillment of prophecy in both the Old Testament and the New, and the Revelation of Jesus Christ, and now is The Day of The Father, while the preceding Day or Cycle was The Day of the Son (Jesus Christ, Glory be unto Him!). The seals upon the Holy Books, referred to in Daniel, have now been removed and all is being made clear. The Spiritual Kingdom has literally been established on earth, and now is the time when man is to be known by his works. Our believers hold to the Positive Reality of actual Christianity, and we pray God that we are sincere when we declare that we are striving to LIVE THE LIFE! Our aim is to love and serve God in Spirit and in Truth, and we KNOW that we cannot do so unless we love and serve our fellow man. We believe that the glad tidings must be and always should have been given 'without money and without price,' as commanded by Jesus Christ."

This is a good illustration of the way such religions are metamorphosed in America.

Behaism has already begun to hold its Summer Conferences in America. At the same time, it is not Persian Behaism, but rather a sort of easy interest in all religions and a feeling of geniality to all, ignoring the inconvenient teachings of the Bab and Beha and their followers. The prospectus of the Green Acre Conferences held at Eliot, Maine, in July and August, 1903, was as follows:

"Believing that the Revelation of the Beha Ullah of Persia is the announcement of this great Day—the beginning of the Golden Age foretold by all seers, sung by poets—and finding that it provides a platform on which the Jew, the Christian (both Catholic and Protestant), the Mohammedan, as well as members of all other great religious bodies can stand together in love and harmony, each holding the form which best nourishes his individual life, an opportunity will be given to all who desire to study its message."

Dr. Potter gives an interesting account of the way stories of American acceptance of Babism are reported in Persia:

"The Behais are at work in the United States and reports of their efforts are circulated in Persia. They announce that an 'American Princess' has accepted their faith, and can show the copy of an American paper with the picture of a lady and her declaration of belief. Her photograph is also shown here. They

That Babism will run a brief course and amount to little in America goes without saying, even in the metamorphosed form which it wears here. What makes it attractive to Americans is probably the loose eclecticism which it seems to have assumed in Abbas Effendi's hands. The prevalent dislike of objective constraints, of exactness in truth, of the meaning of Christ's words, "I came to set men at variance," and the soft indiscriminateness of so many minds, coupled with a reaction against the historic, scientific spirit account for much of its currency here. "Another characteristic of Behaism," says Mr. Phelps in his defence of Abbas Effendi and his system, "as refreshing and

have also the photograph of a large group of their followers in front of a residence, said to be in Chicago. What they say of their work in Cincinnati may be of interest, so I translate part of the report which has come into my hands:

"'My spirit thy sacrifice. I wrote you an account of my arrival in Cincinnati; please God, it reached you.

"'Now I humbly submit that to-day is the seventh day since my arrival in this city. In these days, by night and by day, we have been busy in meeting friends and converts. When we saw the spirit of inquiry and devotion beyond description in the friends, we determined to remain here some weeks, and the friends gave notice to outside souls, that they might be drawn (to the faith).

"'This plan was accepted with completeness of devotion and some, whose houses were in distant sections, left their houses and took quarters in Laconda, which is the residence of this humble servant, that they might be present all the time to hear the new doctrine. They also rented a large place and hired furniture and held meetings every night; and by the action of the deliberative assembly, which I established for them, other matters were, by the grace of God, regulated and settled; that all the congregations which should be gathered in other cities might receive the desired writings and messages.

"'But a telegram from Port Said arrived, that according to the blessed command, I must go to New York and the intention of remaining here was changed to that of journeying. At once I notified the friends that I must depart. On hearing this, they were much affected, but since it was the blessed command, they heartily accepted it. This humble servant promised to send them always the new messages and the deliverances, translated.

"'One of the converts, Mr. Tasun, a learned and eloquent man well informed in the customary history and sciences, and formerly a salaried officer of the Government, in order to receive instruction, gave up his office and went to Chicago for a time, and having gained some acquaintance with the new doctrine, is now teaching history, etc., in one of the churches to a congregation of about three hundred.'

"This gentleman is reported as having introduced the Persian missionary as an Oriental philosopher, who desired to converse with them, wherefore they all rose and saluted him, and he spoke to them for an hour and a half. All present manifested their pleasure, delight, desire and progress, and requested that meetings be appointed that they might acquire further information of these wonderful matters and new doctrines.

"As the missionary was under the necessity of leaving Cincinnati, he referred them to the gentleman above mentioned, who has some of the new books and teachings, and to whom additional matters are to be sent."

attractive as it is striking to the mind accustomed to the dogmatic narrowness of the modern Christian Church, is its marvellous spirit of liberality. It recognizes every other religion as equally divine in origin with itself. It professes only to renew the message formerly given by the Divine Messengers who founded those religions, and which has been more or less forgotten by men. If revelations have differed it has only been in degree, determined in the several cases by the differing capacities of men in different stages of human development to receive them. No man is asked to desert his own faith; but only to look back to its fountain-head and discern, through the mists and accumulations of time, the true spirit of its founders."[1]

Again Mr. Phelps says:

> "The characteristic of Abbas Effendi, regarded as a religious leader, which is at once the most striking, the most attractive, the most impressive, is his generous and tolerant liberality. It is disappointing to find that narrowness and intolerance have already shown themselves in the teachings of some of his followers—a perversion and degradation of true religion which is seen to be an almost inevitable tendency of human nature in all ages of the world, and which most religions have suffered in the hands of their adherents. The chief glory of Behaism is that its true spirit, as exemplified in its Great Apostle, is utterly free from it.
>
> "I shall state at length his attitude in this respect in a subsequent chapter, here merely mentioning two incidents, illustrating it, which were related to me in Akka.
>
> "One was that of a gentleman who wrote to Abbas Effendi to this effect: That he recognized him as a man of great spiritual force, and who, in urging upon men the observance of the Law of Love, was doing much in the service of humanity; that he desired to work with him and for him; but that also he (Abbas Effendi) had said some things with which he did not agree, and that he himself had some spiritual light, which he did not wish to surrender.
>
> "Abbas Effendi replied that he welcomed him as a co-worker; that he asked him to give up nothing; that he approved of his continuing to adhere to any religious faith with which he might be associated, and that the one thing necessary was to love God above all things and seek Him.
>
> "The other case was that of a lady who was visiting Abbas Effendi in Akka. She had accepted him as her religious teacher, and desired to assist in spreading his teachings. When about to return to her home, she told him that her associations were all in the orthodox Christian Church, and that her friends would be repelled by the idea of a new religion. He advised her to return as a Christian, to remain in the Christian Church, and to teach what she had learned as the true teaching of Christ."[2]

---

[1] Phelps, *Abbas Effendi*, p. xxxvii.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 95–97.

The novelty of this will soon be over, and the people who did not have sufficient discernment to discover the truth that will satisfy them in Christianity, will not find it in Beha Ullah or Abbas Effendi. What the religion of the Bab, in this form or that, may accomplish in Persia and for Persia, cannot be foreseen.

The question of more vital importance for us is, whether a great movement betraying a deep hunger in human hearts for the fellowship of a living, loving God, a movement embracing a million of our fellow men groping blindfold about the great altar stairs of heaven, shall be allowed to spend itself and disappear, or drop back to the level of life from which it sprang without receiving its answer from those who know that in Jesus Christ, the Eternal Word, the only begotten Son of the Father, there is life for all who are standing with the Bab, at the Gate.

Supplement to Chapter III

The Religion of the Bab

I

Dr. George W. Holmes, who was for more than twenty years one of the most successful and trusted missionaries in Persia and who is one of the best authorities on Babism has kindly answered the following questions:

1. "Has Christianity anything to do with the origin of the Babi movement?" Christianity has much to do with it. Persia never accepted Islam from conviction, and educated Persians are, as a rule, quite indifferent to its claims upon their consciences, however ready they may be to yield to its claims as a political and social system. But the horde of mollahs and hereditary sayids are interested in keeping the faith pure and orthodox, and all attempts within the fold to soften the asperities of the orthodox faith have always been met by them with bitter opposition and there is now a reaction towards Christianity on the part of many who feel the need of a God less unapproachable than the God of Islam, one less exacting in points of ceremonial, and having more of human sympathy. Sufiism is too impersonal, Christianity makes too great demands upon the will and affections in working righteousness. But the need of a God manifest in the flesh is satisfied in Beha, who, claiming to be the Divine Essence, present in all preceding manifestations, now becomes the culmination of the progressive series by appearing Himself in Person, thus fulfilling all things written in the Law and the Prophets concerning the Messiah and His Kingdom and appearing as the God Man, the revealer of God to man and the mediator between man and the great abstraction whom Mohammedans are taught to adore and to obey, but whom they are not expected to love. And so it is that whenever a Mahdi arises in Mohammedan lands, he finds multitudes ready to welcome his message and to receive him as their deliverer. And so it is natural that in order to meet the need which all feel who have turned in disgust from the dry husks of Islam, the coming one should assume the garb and arrogate to himself the claims of and profess to dispense the blessings which pertain only to the Son of God. The whole Behai movement is in fact, whatever may have been in the mind of its originator the Bab, a counterfeit of the Messiahship of Christ. At least this is the side of it that is turned towards both Christians and Jews. The system

has a facet for each of the world religions, appealing with the Moslem to the Koran, with the Hindoo to the Vedas, with the Chinese to Confucius, etc. But the appeal is in fact to the original autographs, whenever there is anything found in any of these religious writings that fails to sustain or that antagonizes Beha's claims. It is the true Torah and Injil, the true Koran and Zend Avesta and Vedas that so unequivocally indorse Beha. Some things appear in them now which seem to oppose his claims, but these are either spurious additions, or by proper interpretation are shown to sustain Beha even more strongly than the passages which are less obscurely worded. All that relates to the second coming of Christ in the Old Testament or the New, is bodily appropriated to himself by Beha and everything in our Scriptures relating to God is boldly applied to himself. The Behais charge upon the Christians the same spiritual blindness in their refusal to recognize and accept Beha as God as that which prevented the Jews from recognizing their Messiah when He came to them. So they charge upon the Moslem the same folly in their rejection of Beha as that which possessed Jews and Christians together in refusing to see in Mohammed the prophet like unto Moses whom the great lawgiver had so long ago foretold. They discover a very plausible analogy between their relations to the Christians now, and that of the early Christians to the Jews. As the failure of the Jews to see the Messiah then was due to spiritual blindness, and was to be overcome by yielding submission to the Holy Spirit, who would then lead them into all truth, so now, submission to the spirit of Beha is essential for one who would attain to a knowledge of the truth in him. Without faith it is impossible to please God. All that is taught in the New Testament about the fruits of the Spirit, about the necessity of the new birth, etc., is made prominent in their teachings also. The failure of the many attempts to reconcile Christianity with pagan cults by gnostic pretenders in the past, could in no wise deter Beha Ullah from making the attempt anew with the help of a cement of Islamic theology, for it is probable that in common with most Orientals, he knows nothing of the history either of nations or religions, except such meagre and distorted statements as could be obtained from Mohammedan authorities. Kheiralla with the aid of his American coadjutor, has worked into his book many western opinions, but he probably obtained most of these in America. He had abundant opportunity, however, of learning of the teachings of the Gnostics as Mohammedan writings abound in denunciations and refutations of the doctrines of the Manichæans.

2. "What effect will the movement have in influencing Persians in their attitude towards Christianity?"

It will bring a few nearer to Christ. By far the greater number of its adherents will be brought into more active antagonism to Christianity than before. As Moslems it was possible for them to recognize grave defects in their religion as compared with Christianity. In Beha these defects are in their eyes remedied and they have, as they believe, secured all that was revealed to the Christian not only, but have gone far in advance and have that in hand for which the Church of Christ has watched and waited so long unsatisfied, the second coming of the Lord. To the Behai as to the early Christian, the Lord is at hand, for though Beha has "withdrawn his presence," it is only for a short time when the fullness of the blessing will come in the establishment of the Kingdom of God on the earth. His witnesses go out into the world speaking that they do know and testifying that they have seen, and their message and their testimony is received as gladly, they claim, as was that of the apostles by the people to whom they went. Though they have no resurrection other than a re-birth into the present world, and no heaven where there is no sin, the message comes to them in some sense as glad tidings, and they are zealous to go forth and make it known to the world. For they find relief from the burdensome exactions both of Islam and Judaism, and have not to meet the Christian demand for personal holiness, and as they are taught to believe that Christianity is but an inferior stage of development of their own faith which has had its day and been abrogated, the Behai can see no philosophical reason for giving up his new-found faith and yielding obedience to Christ.

But even Christ made not so unqualified a demand for the surrender to Himself of the will of His followers as Beha, for Christ offers testimony to His claims which does not suppress, but rather appeals to the reason, whereas Beha demands a blind faith, which independently of all testimony, accepts him as God. Christ says, "If any man will do His (the Father's) will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God or whether I speak of Myself." Beha says, "If any man will do my will, he shall know of the doctrine." Christ's appeal is to the Father in His witness of the Word and the witness of the Spirit. Beha's appeal is wholly to his own word, and to his own arbitrary and forced interpretations of the Word of God, which interpretations as he states, find their sanction solely in his own authority. Being God (an assumption so far offering no proof but his own word) he is the author of the Scriptures and therefore their infallible interpreter. It follows that whatever interpretation he chooses to give to any text is law and gospel to his fellow men, though it contradict the meaning of the simplest passages. Therefore whenever he makes the claim that a given prophecy relates to himself, there is no further room for argument. When he says that a given text has not a literal but a figurative interpretation (as for instance, that Jesus raised Lazarus and others from the dead), no man may question that deliverance, for he who inspired the writing is he who has given its meaning. He then offers all the Old and New Testament writings and equally the Koran, the Vedas and all other religious books as proofs of his claims. The neophyte sees that the conclusion is irresistible, not recognizing that the major premise on which it rests is a mere assumption. He has committed his will and reason as well to the keeping of his master, and must necessarily accept with full assurance of faith all his master's teachings. Should he question in the slightest degree any of these conclusions, he is told that he is yet in darkness and that without faith no one can enter into the light. There must be absolute surrender of the will or no enlargement of the understanding. This is plainly the livery of heaven. The Behais talk as glibly of the gifts and grace of the Spirit, and as beautifully as any Christian saint could do. It is all counterfeit but a counterfeit which deceives the ones who put it forth as well as those who accept it, and is one very difficult to expose among a people deficient in the logical faculty and having the critical sense almost wholly undeveloped.

Though there is an outward semblance of fellowship for Christians on the part of Behais, there can be little doubt from the intolerance they show to those who recant, that should they gain power enough they would be as ready to persecute Christians as was Mohammed to put to death the Jews of Medina. Nevertheless I believe that Behaism is destined to prove a solvent for Islam which will eventually assist materially in breaking down the resistance of that stubborn and unyielding system of error, itself then perishing also in the ruin it has helped to bring about. Indirectly it will thus hasten the triumph of the Cross of Christ, though only as the wrath of man is made to serve God's purposes.

3. "What should be its effect on our apologetic statements of Christianity to Mohammedans, Behais, etc.?"

They must be re-stated. The traditional methods of exegesis as employed by many of our helpers, simply play into the hands of the Behais. Though he had probably encountered only the less well informed of Christian converts in Syria and Persia, I think it was not entirely an idle boast of one of the Behai missionaries at Hamadan when he told me that he had overthrown every Christian controversialist whom he had yet encountered. It is true that he later said the same thing about me, but if so, he had to make new breaches in the wall before he gained entrance. If we are at liberty to interpret the Scriptures literally when it suits the convenience of our argument to do so, or figuratively at will, regardless of context or of historic setting or perspective, then we are compelled to allow them the same liberty: and they can easily discount us in such a contest, since they know nothing of history and care less, and they have a facility in basing a fanciful interpretation on the numerical value of a letter or a name, or on an assumed grammatical relation of the different parts of a sentence, to which a western expert in exegesis could never hope to attain.

The missionary who is called upon to make apologetic statements of Christianity to Behais must make sure that he himself knows what Christianity is. He must have seen with his own eyes, and have heard with his own ears Him of whom he speaks. This is equally true in all Christian work. But in this kind of controversy it is necessary that one should see, not alone for one's self but for one's antagonist also, if he is to be convinced. The other has not my faith which makes all too clear to me that which is all mist to him. One must see with the other's eyes as well as his own, or he cannot detect and expose the fallacies which have entangled him. When the reciprocal vision is exercised one will often find also that what he had thought to be a rock in his own foundation is just what the other had seen it to be, a mere bank of sand. Much of the current allegorical and figurative interpretations of prophecy are as beautiful and in such a discussion as unsubstantial as the rainbow. The undoubted value to the Christian of such interpretations as aids to faith and for edification rests on another basis.

We must go down deeper than this if we expect to carry conviction to the hearts of those we wish to lead in the way of life. If I teach that the will must be absolutely surrendered to Christ before one can expect to attain to the knowledge of the truth, that if one wills to do His will he shall know of the doctrine, I must be prepared to show at the same time why the Behai should not apply the same principle to himself in his relation to him whom he supposes to be greater than Christ. This takes us back to the ultimate principles of evidence, to the psychological constitution of the human understanding, and the recognition of its needs which we find in the Bible. Does the Bible represent God as demanding of us a blind faith in His Word, unsupported by adequate evidence? Or does it represent Him as offering such evidence and constantly appealing to our reason to differentiate between the true and the false? Does Christ demand faith in His own unsupported Word or does He repeatedly appeal to the witnesses of the Father, of the Word, and of His own works?—the witness of the Father as it seems to me not in His audible words, which were not heard by the multitude, but in the witness of His spirit in the heart of each one who was willing to recognize His voice there, telling them that the Christ recognized by their understanding answered perfectly to the highest and holiest image of God which the Spirit had imprinted on their hearts, fulfilling their most perfect conceptions of what God ought to be and holding up Him whom they saw in life as a companion picture to their inward vision of Him. If I teach that Christianity consists in a body of doctrine, I must then be prepared to show, not alone to my own satisfaction but to that of my hearer, wherein it is so immeasurably superior to the body of doctrine which he has accepted that it must instantly claim his allegiance. Possibly I may not succeed at once in convincing him that it is not his own creed that I am offering him, that it is not a part of, and included in his own more comprehensive declaration of faith.

If I teach that the Christian religion does not consist of dogma, but in allegiance to a Divine Person, I see him smile for his religion consists wholly in allegiance to a Divine Person spelled with a larger P. How shall I differentiate the True from the false? Easily enough for the satisfaction of my own heart and my own understanding, but how shall I see what it really is that he sees and is deceived by, and how shall I clear away the mists which prevent his seeing with my vision? Surely nothing but the illumination of the Holy Spirit can enable him to see, but am I prepared to be used of the Spirit for that purpose? If so I must not only pray but labour to see true myself, so that I may see true for him also.

The character of Christ is too marvellous a thing, too great in its quality and its complexity for any single generation or age to see it in its entirety. This proposition no Christian could think of questioning nor that all the ages past and future could not know Him perfectly. He can only be studied in detail, and what our fathers saw, though it helps us also to see, does not help us in the same degree as it did them. For we necessarily see Him from a somewhat different angle. We should take account of this and remember that however much we may be able to enter by reason of heredity or environment or sympathy into our fathers' vision of God, we cannot accept their own point of view, and if we say we see just as they did, we are probably deceiving ourselves as well as others. For no two persons ever yet saw exactly the same mountain or the same grain of sand. No two have seen just the same Christ. To each believer is given the new name known only to himself and to Christ, and each one sustains a different relation to Him from every other individual.

We are still less likely to make unbelievers see just as our fathers saw, since, if they are also Orientals, they are subjects of a different heredity and environment, which necessarily affect to some extent their visual field. Let us recognize this and let us make a worthy effort to discover the point of view of those we would teach, so that, when we talk with them of something we have both seen with the eyes of the understanding, we may make sure that we have both seen approximately the same thing, and that we are not each talking of a wholly different thing, supposing it to be the same. Do not many of our controversies arise from similar causes? How then are we to see our faith as it is, to get down to the foundation principles, to divest it of the things that are not essential to its integrity, but which may be accretions which obscure the clearness of its definition and mar its symmetry? I cannot answer the question but I am quite certain we shall not accomplish it unless we recognize the need, and make an honest effort to provide for it. For myself I have found some help in reverting to first principles, and in following them out, observing how Christ in His personality and in His teachings seems to fit in with and satisfy the nature of things, as no other human being has ever done. Surely the Christian who has once entered into vital personal relations of fellowship with his Lord, requires for himself no other evidence, sometimes feels indeed as though other evidence were an offence to his understanding. This will doubtless in the long run prove the most convincing also to others, through the influence of the life in Christ lived before the world, but another line of argument is also needed in apologetics. One great difficulty in dealing with the Behais is that whatever we say of Christ that commends itself to them, they immediately transfer to Beha so that we are in a sense placed in the attitude of ourselves indirectly glorifying him. May God give us all His wisdom that we may be able to confound the wisdom of this world with all its sophistries! But no statement of Christian doctrines can avail to draw any one to Christ so long as there is no sense of sin in the soul and this touches the weak spot in the experience of so many Orientals, converts and others. With Mohammedans and Jews alike sin is thought of rather as a violation of the ceremonial law than as an attitude of antagonism towards God, and in this respect Oriental Christians till their hearts have been touched by the Spirit of God, are not essentially different from the others. There can never be any evolution of Christian doctrine, nor any evolution of the natural man, which will do away with the necessity of repentance for, and repudiation of sin as an essential condition of salvation, and it should be our aim, no less than it has been the aim of the fathers, though it may be by different lines of approach, to awaken in the heart a sense of the sinfulness of sin and the need of a Saviour.

II

THE BABITES[1]

BY HENRY HARRIS JESSUP, D.D.

From the Outlook, June 22, 1901

In the summer of 1897 an aged Persian Sheikh came to the American Press in Beirut, bringing a large sheet of pasteboard on which he wished a map to be mounted. On one side it was glazed with black varnish, and had inscribed on it in elegant Persian script in gold letters the Arabic words "Ya Beha el Abha," "O Glory of the most Glorious," the Babite motto. Our clerk, perceiving this, asked the Sheikh for the card, and said he would mount the map on a new and better one.

That Beha motto now hangs in my study. The old Sheikh said, in explanation of his scheme of mounting a map on the face of this beautiful motto, "I have had this hanging on the wall of my room and prayed to it for twelve years, and found it to be vanity and worthless. I now prefer to read the Bible."

Ever since the first Babite reform movement in Persia in 1845, the Christian world has hoped that some of its liberal tenets might lead the Persian people to Christianity. But thus far the hope has not been realized. Those who read the Bible seem to prefer to find an occult inner double meaning in the simplest language, and construct for themselves a kind of mystic religious philosophy in which the Persians delight.

According to the best authorities, Babism arose as follows:

Mirza Ali Mohammed appeared in Shiraz in 1845, a pupil of Sheikh Ahmed Zein ed Din, who taught a mixture of Sufiism, mystic philosophy, and Moslem Shiite law, and said that the absent Mahdi, now in a spiritual world called Jabalka and Jabersa, would soon appear, and that he was the Bab or Door of the Mahdi. He then made up a system composed of Moslem, Nusairiyeh, Jewish, and heathen doctrines; and then claimed to be Bab ed Dîn, and afterwards the Nukta or Centre and Creator of truth, and then that he was Deity personified; then that he was the prophet Mohammed, and produced a new book called the *Beyan*, which is the Babite Bible, in twenty thousand verses, Arabic and Persian. Complaint was made of its bad grammar and that this is a sign of imperfection. He explained the ungrammatical Arabic by the fact that the words and letters rebelled and sinned in a previous world, then transmigrated to this world, and, as a punishment for sin in a previous existence, were put under grammatical rules; but he in mercy forgave all sinners, even to the letters of the alphabet, and released them, and now they can go as they please!

He was followed by tens of thousands. In 1849 he was killed, with multitudes of his followers. Among his followers was a beautiful and eloquent woman named Selma, who divorced her husband and followed Ali Mohammed the Bab, who styled her Kurret el Ain (light or refreshment to the eye). Ali Mohammed raised an army to fight the Persian troops, but was caught and strangled.

---

[1] I have preserved Dr. Jessup's spelling of proper names in this article.

Before Ali Mohammed's death he said his successor would be a young disciple named Yahya. This Mirza Yahya succeeded him, taking the title of "Subh Azel"—morning of eternity.

The Bab made the month nineteen days, answering to the nineteen members of the sacred hierarchy of which the Bab is the chief.

Subh Azel was the fourth in the hierarchy, and on the death of the Bab Ali Mohammed, and the two others above him on the list, he became chief of the sect by regular promotion. Upon the outbreak of persecution against them, Subh Azel and his older brother Mirza Hassein Ali, who was styled Beha Allah, fled to Baghdad and remained from 1853 to 1864, then to Adrianople. Beha had persuaded Subh Azel to retire and conceal himself from human gaze, saying to the people that he was present but invisible. Beha then claimed the succession, and two hostile parties arose, Azelites and Behaites. They were both then exiled (1864) to Adrianople, where plots and poisoning among the two parties, and anonymous letters sent to the Sultan charging each other with political conspiracies, led the Sultan to exile (in 1866) Subh Azel to Famagusta in Cyprus, and Beha Allah to Acre. Four of the Azelites were sent with Beha, and their leader claimed that Beha was instrumental in having all of them assassinated in Acre.

Subh Azel died before 1880, and Beha in 1892.

Beha left three sons—Abbas Effendi, now sixty; Mohammed Ali, now forty-five; and Bedea, now aged thirty-five. Mohammed Ali claims that the father Beha appointed him spiritual head and Abbas secular head, but Abbas has usurped both. They are now divided, the two younger brothers being in a bitter lawsuit with Abbas, who has all the prestige of holding the funds, and the reputation among his followers of being a re-incarnation of Christ.

To understand Babism, we should remember the sources from which it was derived. Jemal ed Din, the Afghani, says that its author borrowed from Hinduism, Pantheism, Sufiism, and the doctrines of Nusairiyeh. The Nusairiyeh of northern Syria believe in one God, self-existent and eternal. This God manifested himself seven times in human form, from Abel to Ali, son of Abi Talib, which last manifestation was the most perfect.

At each of these manifestations the Diety made use of two other persons, the first created out of the light of his essence and by himself, and the second created by the first.

The Diety is called the Maana—the meaning or reality of all things; the second, the Ism—name or veil, because by it the Maana conceals its glory, while, by it, it reveals itself to men. The third, the Bab—Door, because through it is the entrance to the knowledge of the two former.

The following table shows the seven trinities of the Nusairiyeh:

Maana.	Ism.	Bab.
1. Abel	Adam	Gabriel
2. Seth	Noah	Yayeel
3. Joseph	Jacob	Ham ibn Cush
4. Joshua	Moses	Daw
5. Asaph	Solomon	Abdullad ibn Simaan
6. Simon (Cephas)	Jesus	Rozabah
7. Ali	Mohammed	Salman el Farisee

After Ali, the Diety manifested himself in the Imams, in some of them totally and in others partially, but Ali is the eternal Maana, the divine essence, and the three are inseparable trinity. Now add to this the mystic teaching of the Mohammedan system of Sufiism or Tusow-wof.

Pure Sufiism teaches that only God exists. He is in all things and all things are in Him All visible and invisible things are in emanation from Him and are not really distinct from Him. Religions are matters of indifference. There is no difference between good and evil, for all is reduced to Unity, and God is the real author of the acts of men. Man is not free in his action. By death the soul returns to the bosom of Divinity, and the great object of life is absorption into the divine nature.

Bear in mind also the doctrine of the Persian or Shiah Moslems, that Ali was the first legitimate Imam, or Caliph of Mohammed, and that he existed before Adam, and that the twelfth Imam, Mohammed Abdal Kasim, was the Mahdi, and that he is now concealed in some secret place and will appear again on earth. Add to this the highly imaginative and mystic character of the Persian mind, its fondness for poetry and religious extravagance, and you have a preparation for the appearance of a man who had the intellect, strong will, and abhorrence of sham to make him a leader among his fellows.

Abbas Effendi, the oldest son of Beha, is now living in Haifa, with about seventy or eighty of his Persian followers, who are called Behaites. Nothing is heard of Subh Azel or his folllowers.

Some years since, Dr. Ibrahim Kheirulla, an educated Syrian of great mental acumen, conceived the idea of introducing Beha-Babism into the United States. He declared Beha to be the Messiah returned to earth and Abbas to be his reincarnation. He visited Abbas, and from time to time, as his accredited agent and promoter, has brought his disciples, chiefly American women, to visit Abbas, and some of them at least have bowed down and worshipped him as the Messiah.

A cousin to Dr. Kheirulla who is clerk of the American Press in Beirut has given me the following statement:

"The Doctor, after the death of his first wife in Egypt in 1882, married first a Coptic widow in El Fayûm, whom he abandoned, and then married a Greek girl whom he also abandoned, and who was still living in 1897 in Cairo. He was at the World's Parliament in Chicago, and tried to promote several mechanical inventions, as a rubber boot, envelopes, buttons, etc. At one time he was worth three thousand pounds. He then obtained the degree of Doctor, and taught mental philosophy. He then helped a Greek priest, Jebara, in publishing a book on the unity of Islam and Christianity, which fell flat and had no influence on the public mind. He then opened a medical clinic to cure nervous diseases by the laying on of hands and reading from Psalm 29:7, the words, 'The voice of the Lord divideth the flames of fire,' etc., etc. Then he went to Chicago and tried trade, and then teaching, and preaching, and pretty much everything else. He is a smart talker, full of plausible argument, and can make white appear black. Of late he has had little to do with religion. It can be said to his credit that, after receiving aid in the Beirut College, he paid back the money advanced to him."

Up to last summer he had the confidence of Abbas Effendi and represented him in the United States. The *Egyptian Gazette* of November, 1900, states that Dr. Kheirulla on his last visit to Haifa differed with Abbas, claiming that Beha Allah only was the true divinity, and Abbas is simply a teacher. Dr. and Mrs. Goetzinger, on the other hand, maintain that Abbas must be worshipped with divine homage, as he is the true Christ. Some of the American Babites now follow Dr. Kheirulla and some Dr. Goetzinger, but the latter has the official credentials, and thus the house is divided against itself.

In Baghdad in 1860 the Babite house was divided into Behaites and Azelites. In Haifa it is divided between Abbas Effendi and his two brothers Mohammed and Bedea. In America it is between Dr. Kheirulla and Dr. Goetzinger.

The *Egyptian Gazette* states that Dr. Goetzinger expected two hundred pilgrims from America to visit and worship Abbas during the present season.

On a recent visit to Haifa I called on Abbas Effendi and had a half-hour's conversation with him. My companion was Chaplain Wells, of Tennessee, recently from the Philippines, who had met at Port Said an American lady on her way to Haifa to visit Abbas Effendi. We met her at the hotel and had a four hours' conversation with her. She seemed fascinated or hypnotized by the Effendi. She had been converted four years ago under Mr. Moody's preaching in New York, attended the Brick Church for a time, and in some way heard of Abbas Effendi as being an eminently holy man. Said she: "I feel in his presence, as I did in Mr. Moody's presence, that he is a very holy man and brings me nearer to God than any other person." She said that she was his guest, and that every morning he expounds the New Testament in Arabic. "His two daughters, who know English, take notes and then translate them to me." We asked her if there were not scores of godly, learned ministers in America who could explain the New Testament in English without needing an interpreter. She said yes, but seemed to have a hazy idea that there was something different in Abbas. While we were conversing in the hotel parlour a tall man passed the door, clad in a long robe, and she whispered to us, "There goes that bad man Bedea Effendi, brother of Abbas, who wants to kill him. He is a spy."

I went out and addressed the man in Arabic, and he told me he was a younger brother of Abbas, and he had a room at this hotel. I sent word by this good lady to Abbas Effendi, and he appointed nine o'clock the next morning for an interview. Chaplain Wells went with me. The Effendi has two houses in Haifa, one for his family, in which the American lady pilgrims are entertained, and one down town, where he receives only men. Here his Persian followers meet him. They bow in worship when they meet him on the street or when they hear his voice. On Friday he prays with the Moslems in the mosque, as he is still reputed a good Mohammedan of the Shiite sect.

We entered a large reception-room, at one end of which was a long divan covered, as usual in Syria, with a white cloth. In a moment he came in and saluted us cordially with the usual Arabic compliments, and then sat down on the end of the divan next to the wall and invited us to sit next to him.

Beha Allah, the father of Abbas, used to wear a veil in the street and live secluded from the gaze of men, living in an atmosphere of mystery which greatly impressed his devout Persian followers. But Abbas Effendi, on succeeding his father, threw off this reserve, and is a man among men. He has been in Beirut often, and has a reputation of being a great scholar in Persian, Turkish, and Arabic, writing with equal ease and eloquence in all. He visits his friends in Haifa, and is a man of great affability and courtesy—traits which characterize many of the Mohammedan and Druze Sheikhs and Effendis whom I know in Beirut, Sidon, Damascus, and Mount Lebanon. After another round of salutations, I introduced myself and Chaplain Wells, and told him that, although a resident of Syria for forty-five years, I had never visited Haifa before, and, having heard and read much of his father and himself, I was glad to meet him.

He asked my profession. I told him I was an American missionary, and was connected with the American Press and Publishing House in Beirut.

"Yes," said he, "I know your Press and your books. I have been in Beirut, and knew Dr. van Dyke, who was a most genial, learned, and eloquent man, and I highly esteemed him."

I said his greatest work was the translation of the Bible into Arabic.

He at once rejoined: "Very true. It is the best translation from the original made into any Eastern language. It is far superior to the Turkish and the Persian versions. The Persian especially is very defective. Nothing is more difficult than to translate the Bible from its original tongues. The translator must fully understand the genius of both languages and grasp the inner spiritual meaning. For instance, Jesus the Christ said, 'I am the bread which came down from heaven.' Now, He did not mean that He was literally bread, but bread signifies grace and blessing; *i. e.*, I came down from heaven as grace and blessing to men's souls. But if you translate that into Persian literally, as bread, it would not be understood. The same difficulty exists," he continued, "in translating the Koran into another language."

I said that I quite agreed with him, as the English translations of the Koran are in a great part dry and vapid, but that there is a difference between translating a text and explaining it. A translator must be faithful to the text itself.

He then said that hundreds had tried to translate the Koran from Arabic into Persian, including the great Zamakhshari, and all had utterly failed.

I remarked that it was a great comfort that the Bible was so well translated into Arabic, and had been so widely distributed, and that since 1865, when Dr. van Dyke completed the translation of the whole Bible, our Press had issued more than six hundred thousand copies, and this year would issue from thirty thousand to fifty thousand copies.

I then remarked that the Mohammedans object to our use of the term "Son of God," and asked him if he regarded Christ as the Son of God.

He said: "Yes, I do; I believe in the Trinity. But the Trinity is a doctrine above human comprehension, and yet it can be understood."

He then asked me: "Did Christ understand the Trine personality of the Deity, *i. e.*, the Trinity?"

I said, "Most certainly."

"Then," said he, "it is understandable, yet *we* cannot understand it."

I replied, "There are many things in nature which we believe and yet cannot understand." I told him the story of the old man who overheard a young man exclaim to a crowd of his companions, "I will never believe what I cannot understand." The old man said to him, "Do you see those animals in the field—the cattle eating grass, and it turns into hair on their backs; sheep eating the same grass, and it turns into wool; and swine eating it, and it becomes bristles on their backs; do you believe this?" The youth said, "Yes." "Do you understand it?" "No." "Then," said the old man, "never say you will not believe what you do not understand."

The Effendi remarked; "Yes, that is like a similar remark made once by a Persian to the famous Zamakhshari, 'I cannot understand this doctrine of God's Unity and Eternity, and I will not believe it.' Zamakhshari replied, 'Do you understand the watery secretions of your own body?' 'No.' 'But you believe they exist? Then say no more you will not believe what you do not understand.'"

I then explained to the Effendi our view of salvation by faith in Christ; that whosoever believeth in Him shall not perish, but have everlasting life, and that, being justified by faith, we have peace with God; that Christ has paid the ransom, and now God can be just, and yet the justifier of them who believe. "And does your Excellency believe this?" He replied promptly, "Yes." "And do you accept the Christ as your Saviour?" He said, "Yes." "And do you believe that Jesus the Christ will come again and judge the world?" He said, "Yes."

I then drew a little nearer to him and said: "My dear friend, I am more than sixty-eight years of age, and you are almost as old, and soon we shall stand together before the judgment seat of Christ. Now I want to ask you a very plain question. I have seen in an American paper (the *Literary Digest*), a statement that an American woman, evidently of sincere character, had stated that she came to Haifa and visited you, and that when she entered your room she felt that she was in the very presence of the Son of God, the Christ, and that she held out her arms, crying, 'My Lord, my Lord,' and rushed to you, kneeling at your blessed feet, sobbing like a child. Now, I could not believe this, and thought it a newspaper invention. I wish to ask you whether this is true. Can it be right for the creature to accept the worship due only to the Creator?"

He smiled and seemed somewhat disturbed, and said, "What is this sudden change of subject? Where were we?—discoursing on the high themes of the Trinity and redemption and divine mysteries, and now you suddenly open an entirely different subject. This is entirely different; let us keep to theological themes."

I replied: "It is a change of subject, but I am seriously anxious to know whether that statement is true."

He then said very calmly, "I am only the poorest and humblest of servants."

I saw that he was not disposed to answer such a point-blank question and seemed much embarrassed, and glanced towards an attendant or disciple, a young Persian, who sat in a chair facing us.

So I took up another question. I said: "The Christ promised to send the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete. Now, the Mohammedans claim that Mohammed is the Paraclete. We claim and believe that He is the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Trinity."

"Yes," said he, "I know that you believe that. That is your doctrine; but that is a very profound subject and very important."

I saw from his manner that he was getting weary of talking, and told him who my companion was—the Rev. Captain Wells, a United States chaplain from the Philippines, who was a strong temperance advocate, and had made a report to President McKinley urging the prohibition of the use of liquor in the United States army. He expressed his approval of the total abstinence principle and his gratification that there is a temperance reading-room in Beirut.

I then alluded to the *Episode of the Bab* written by Prof. E. G. Browne, of Cambridge, and asked him if he knew Professor Browne and his book? He replied: "Professor Browne has not comprehended our views. He heard us and then heard our enemies (the Subh Azelites), and wrote down the views of all. How can he get the truth? Now, supposing that a man wanted to learn about the Jews, and you are, we will suppose, an anti-Semite. He asks you about the Jews and writes down your views. Then he asks a Rabbi and takes down his views, and prints both. How can he get at the real truth? So with Professor Browne. He sees us through the eyes of our enemies."

I then invited the Effendi to let me know when he came to Beirut, that I might call on him. He replied: "When I come to Beirut, I shall do myself the honour of calling upon you."

And then we took our leave, with the usual profuse Arabic salutations.

Now, what can one say in brief of such a man? Whether intentionally on his part or not, he is now acting what seems to be a double part—a Moslem in the mosque, a Christ, or at least a Christian mystic, at his own house. He prays with the Moslems, "There is no God but God," and expounds the Gospels as an incarnation of the Son of God. His dislike of Professor Browne comes from the fact that Professor Browne visited Subh el Azel in Cyprus and obtained from him documents which reflect seriously upon Beha Allah, and charge him with assassination and other crimes.

His declarations of belief in the Trinity and redemption through the Christ must be interpreted in the light of Sufiist pantheism and of his belief in a succession of incarnations, of which his followers regard him as the last and greatest.

It is difficult to regard without indignation the Babite proselytism now being carried on in the United States. One American woman who passed through Beirut recently, *en route* for the Abbas Effendi shrine, stated that she was at first an agnostic and found that a failure; then she tried Theosophy, and found that too thin; then she tried Christian Science and obtained a diploma authorizing her to heal the sick and raise the dead, and found that a sham, and now was on her way to see what Abbas Effendi had to offer!

Surely that woman has found out what it is to feed on ashes.

At the military barracks in Beirut is a tower clock with an eastern face keeping eastern time, in which it is always twelve o'clock at sunset, and a western face keeping European time. Abbas Effendi seems to the people of Syria to have these two faces—the eastern for the Moslems and the Turkish Government by which he is kept in exile from Persia; and the western for the pilgrims who come from New York and Chicago.

On Mount Carmel are certain round stones, geodes of flint, hollow and lined with crystals of quartz. The people call them Elijah's watermelons. They look smooth and round and melon-like on the outside, but inside are nothing but crystals, which would tax the digestion of a tougher man than even the stalwart Tishbite. These pilgrims are attracted by the rumour of spiritual fruits in Haifa just under the Carmel of Elijah, but they may find to their sorrow that there is no more true nourishment in them than in Elijah's watermelons.

III

In the paper already quoted on pp. 134–138 the late Dr. Shedd wrote of the relation of Babism to Christianity:

"It remains to inquire what is the relation of Babism to the missionary work.

"When the Bab passed through Urumia in 1850 on the way to his execution, the missionaries watched the excitement with great interest. The crowds of people were ready to receive him as the long expected Imam, even the water in which he bathed was regarded as holy water. Since then, the missionaries have ever had a strong desire to utilize the movement, but have found the Babis so satisfied or mystified with their own fanciful ideas, and so urgent in their argument for a fuller revelation to suit the present age, that they felt no need of Christ. Our colporteurs have kept in touch with the different sects in all parts of the country and reported the Babis. The congenial field for Babism is not among the rough Turkish race of the north and west of Persia, but among the gentler Persian race of the south and east. The missionaries come from Ispahan and beyond. Two of them have been at Urumia for several weeks previous to this date. They have great assurance, and are ready to discuss with Jews, Christians and Moslems, always with great caution lest they be betrayed to their enemies. Their arguments are from the Pentateuch, and especially from Daniel and Revelation for Jews and Christians, and from the Koran for Moslems. The Jews are not always proof against the infection. Some are said to believe, others are turned away from the true teachings of the Scriptures. In other places, especially in the darker regions where our colporteurs seldom penetrate, the Jews are much affected. Last year, two of the colporteurs wrote from such places: 'We must hasten to enlighten these Jews, or they will all fall in the snare.' Babism offers the Jew a system non-persecuting, suiting his unitarian view of God, and nearer his hopes of an earthly Messiah and kingdom than Christianity. The Christian faith alone has the resources to meet the sophistries of the Babis. The argument of the Moslem is the sword, not reasoning from the Koran and traditions. I have heard of no case of a Christian's conversion to Babism or of a

Babi's conversion to Christianity.[1] Is it because the chasm of the two faiths is impassible, or because the affinities have not yet been fully established? What shall be the attitude we take? Shall we consider the new creed, now accepted by many thousands of Persians, as for us or against us in the conflict with Islam?

"On the favourable side, we may mention:

"1. It is a most radical reform that revolutionizes the established religion of Persia, and thus breaks down the barriers of intolerance and comes into sympathy with Christianity.

"2. In practical duties, compared with Islam, it has a very liberal aspect. It is a protest against the hard legalism and Pharisaism of the mollahs. It exposes their intolerance and corruptions and scandalous vices, and teaches sincerity and gentleness, and thus is breaking down the civil and social system of the prevailing faith, and in so far is an ally of Christianity.

"3. The adherents of the Bab claim a friendship and kinship with Christians on these common grounds. The following extract from Mr. Browne's record expresses this feeling in stronger terms, perhaps, than usual. 'Yes,' said the Babi, 'we are much nearer to you in sympathy than the Mohammedans. To them, you are unclean and accursed; if they associate with you, it is only by overcoming their religious prejudices. But we are taught to regard all good men as clean and pure, whatever their religion. With you Christians especially, we have sympathy. Has it not struck you how similar were the life and death of our founder (whom we indeed believe to have been Christ Himself returned to earth) and the Founder of your faith? Both were wise even in their childhood, beyond the comprehension of those around them; both were pure and blameless in their lives; both at last were done to death by a fanatical priesthood and a Government alarmed at the love and devotion which they inspired in their disciples.' This is very fairly spoken, but one is at a loss to know how far such language comes from the hope of winning converts. Mr. Browne is one much in love with Oriental mysticism, and one whom the Babis hoped to win over to their belief.

"Beyond the points just mentioned, I cannot see that Christians and Babis can have much in common.

"*The Unfavourable Relations to Mission Work.*

"1. The movement arose entirely outside of Christian influence. It is an outgrowth of Persian Mohammedanism, of the sect of the Sheikhis, without a single doctrine derived from the New Testament. The face of Babism is not towards Christianity, but towards the pantheism of the East. It turns away from the God of Islam, who is an absolute monarch far removed from man and his needs. The Bab brings God near, but not through Christ by way of reconciliation, not by regarding God as a loving Father, who through the Son and Spirit is bringing us into fellowship with Himself. The Bab brings God near through pantheism. The universal spirit is manifested in all men. By self-renunciation and abstraction a man may escape the illusion of plurality and attain to the unity and blessedness of true being and say, 'I am God.' Christ said this, and so the Bab and Beha and so many others yet to come. This misty pantheism is harder for the missionary to deal with than the fatalistic unitarian conception of God presented by Islam.

---

[1] "'I have not heard of a Babi's conversion to Christ,'" comments Dr. Holmes. "At the time Dr. Shedd was reading this paper, one of our most consecrated and efficient helpers, was almost within earshot. He was a convert from Behaism, and there are various others who have likewise renounced Beha for Christ. But the rest of the statement holds good. I do not know of a single original Christian in Persia who has been converted to Behaism. Some Behais who made a profession of Christianity turned back to Beha, but none of whom we were at any time fully satisfied that their profession of faith in Christ was sincere."

"2. The doctrine of manifestations renders the Babis insensible to Christian influence. They accept Christ most fully, and no one can go beyond them in praise of His Divine nature; but His mission has ended. The inconsistency of applying the same prediction to the Holy Spirit, to Mohammed, and to Beha is overcome by saying that the signs apply equally to all successive manifestations. The argument from the unapproachable personality of Christ is met by the statement that Beha is also a man of perfection, and that Christ showed indications of His weakness in His outcry in Gethsemane and on the Cross. The Cross of Christ is made of none effect. The phenomeon of the Bab and Beha eclipses the Sun of Righteousness.

"This doctrine, taken with the fact that a new faith has a charm which for the time satisfies the religious need, renders the Babis difficult to reach. Through the darkness of pantheism they cannot see the need of a Saviour. The Moslems often feel a need and confess that their system has proved a failure, but the Babis are in the zeal and assurance of a new religion. They study the New Testament not as disciples to learn, but as partisans who will fortify their theory. All previous Scriptures are valuable to them only in so far as they testify to the new faith.

"3. Their basis of morals is quite far from our faith, perhaps farther removed than the doctrine of Islam. It has been truly said of Islam: 'Mohammedan law is based on the theory that right and wrong depend on legal enactment. Moral acts have no inherent moral character. An act is right because God has commanded it, and wrong because He has forbidden it. God may abrogate or change His laws so that what was wrong may become right. So it is impossible to discuss the moral character of the prophet, because it is sufficient answer to any criticism to say that God commanded or expressly permitted those acts which in other men would be wrong. Thus God's moral nature is not known. There is no comprehension that God is a moral being doing what is right because it is right, that He could not be just and justify the sinner without an atonement made by the incarnation, sufferings and death of Christ. Sin is not regarded as itself corruption, nor is there any need of regeneration and sanctification by the Holy Spirit before the soul can know the joy of the beatific vision.' This statement applies with increased emphasis to the Babis. There is no clear distinction between good and evil, no perception of sin, they wander in the fog.

"4. The Babist freedom runs to license, and hence as a reform leaves men worse rather than better. Mr. Browne found himself in the meshes of the opium habit in Kirman by yielding too freely to the influence of his Babi friends. The poetess Kurratu 'l-Ain praises opium, though Beha afterwards forbade it. There is undoubtedly a generous fellowship in the Babi community, but there is no moral principle. . . . There are no high and strong characters developed to lead the world in true reform, no high motives to virtue are developed. The seeds of its own destruction are in the system, and the best arguments against this as other errors will soon be its fruits."[1]

---

[1] *Missionary Review of the World*, December, 1894, pp. 901–903.

The Emancipation of Latin America

IV

THE EMANCIPATION OF LATIN AMERICA

THE subjugation by Spain and Portugal of the immense territories extending from Mexico on the north to Chili on the south was accomplished in little more than fifty years. The same years witnessed also the appropriation of the territories in southeastern North America, which were subsequently incorporated in the United States. "In 1492, Columbus planted the Cross and the standard of Spain in a small island in the West Indies. In 1495, Hispaniola or Haiti was made the centre of Spanish authority in the New World. In 1500 Brazil was discovered. The Rio de la Plata was entered in 1508. Cuba was subjugated in 1511. Two years later, Balboa crossed the Isthmus of Darien and took dramatic possession of the Pacific for the Spanish crown. By 1521, Cortes had conquered Mexico. Ten years later, Pizarro overturned the Peruvian empire and stripped the Incas of their fabulous wealth. Four years more rolled by and the first disastrous attempt was made to build the city now known as Buenos Ayres; and in 1547 Santiago de Chili was founded."[1]

It was a great racial movement, inspired by ideas, romantic, religious and financial. The passion of it dominated for a while the entire population of Portugal and Spain, as it dominated no other people. "The Venetian Ambassador, Andre Nanagiero, who travelled through Spain in 1525 . . . notices the general fever of emigration. Seville, in particular was so stripped of its inhabitants, he says, 'that the city was left almost to the women.'"[2] After a while, the stern hardships of life in a new land, the collapse of the dreams of limitless gold at once for every one, and the natural decay of enthusiasm led to a cessation of the great streams of emigration, but by that time the Spanish and Portuguese were planted solidly in the New World and the change in its destinies was irrevocable.

---

[1] Brown, *Latin America*, pp. 63f.

[2] Prescott, *Conquest of Peru*, p. 189.

The political subjection of Iberian America to Spain and Portugal was synonymous with its ecclesiastical subjection to the Roman Catholic Church. The first conquerors were devout Catholics and their whole enterprise wore the aspect of a religious crusade. "Pizarro, on his voyage to Peru, was required to take priests or monks on every vessel. This became the fixed rule for all expeditions to America. Velasquez wrote to Cortes to remember that the chief purpose of his expedition was the conversion of the natives."[1] But apart from the work of priests, the secular character of the expeditions was covered over and interpenetrated with religion. The political conquest was a conquest for the Church. "The people conquered by the Spaniards in the Indies," says a Mexican historian, Gen. Vicente Riva Palacio, "did not have even a remote idea of Christian doctrine or Catholic worship; but they looked upon their conversion to that doctrine and worship as a necessary consequence of their defeat in battle, as an indispensable requisite which affirmed their vassalage and slavery to the Spanish monarch; since as this was the principal motive which the conquerors assigned for the invasion, they, however rude we may suppose them to have been, knew that on the outcome of the campaign depended the religion which they were to have in the future, since they would have to adopt that of the Christians, as soon as they were victorious."[2]

But with the armies, as has been said, came the missionaries also. The year after Columbus's discovery, Bernardo Boil, the "first apostolic vicar to the New World landed in Haiti as superior of a band of twelve missionaries." In 1510, Las Casas the great friend of the Indians was ordained, the first presbyter to be consecrated in America. With steadily increasing energy and unflagging devotion the Church strove to establish itself on broad and immovable foundations on both continents of the New Hemisphere. It was fertile and courageous in its methods. The missionaries demolished the temples and overthrew the idols. Saghagun says that in Mexico "they demolished in a short time all the Aztec temples, great and small, so that not a vestige of them remained." They built in their stead great Christian churches. So energetic and magnificent was their work in this direction that measures were taken to moderate their zeal and their extravagance on what Archbishop Montufar called in 1556 "sumptuous and superfluous works which the monks make in the towns of the Indians and at the expense of these latter."[1] Besides all this, the missionaries preached everywhere, at first through interpreters and then directly, and baptized multitudes until they were forced to desist from weariness. Bishop Zumarraga wrote in 1551 to Matios Veysen, the commissary general of missions, "My reverend father, we labour with assiduity in the conversion of the Indians and the grace of God has crowned our efforts. Up to the present time, we have baptized more than a million of these pagans, demolished more than five hundred of their temples and burned and destroyed more than twenty thousand idols."[2] This was in Mexico. In Paraguay, the Jesuits at the time of their expulsion in 1767 had gathered "upwards of 1,000,000, converts."[3]

---

[1] Brown, *Latin America*, p. 72.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 74.

The conquerors maintained from the beginning an attitude of superiority over the natives. A system of slavery soon grew up, in justification of which some held that Indians were not rational creatures and had no souls. The fame of Las Casas, who brought Guatemala under the influence of Christianity by the simple preaching of the Gospel[4] rests on his defence of the Indians against their masters. Through his influence chiefly, Pope Paul III, in 1537, issued the bull declaring that "the said Indians and all other peoples who hereafter shall be brought to the notice of Catholics, although they may be without the faith of Jesus Christ, in no wise are they to be deprived of their liberty and of the control of their goods; in no wise are they to be made slaves. . . . We also determine and declare that the said Indians and other similar peoples are to be called to the faith of Jesus Christ by preaching and by the example of a good, holy life."[5] The fame of Las Casas as an exceptional friend of the Indians, the fact that the missionaries belonged to the dominant race and displayed its spirit, their reluctance to admit natives to the priesthood, the evidence of practical slavery among the people under the control of the Church, show that the Church was not able to separate itself wholly from the spirit of the conquerors towards the natives; though undoubtedly its influence at first was distinctly meliorating. As Riva Palacio says of Mexico, "The severe and impartial historian must declare that during the first years of Spanish rule in Mexico, the services to humanity, civilization and the progress of the colony rendered by the religious orders were so eminent that actions which otherwise might be presented as serious faults can be readily condoned."[1]

---

[1] Brown, *Latin America*, p. 87.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 93.

[3] Parish, *History of Buenos Ayres*, p. 256; Quoted by Brown, *Latin America*, p. 101.

[4] Butterworth, *South America*, pp. 88f.

[5] Quoted by Brown, *Latin America*, p. 70.

Society soon settled into fixed ways. The native population if not in slavery, yet constituted a subject class. Great cities grew up in which the foreigners and their descendants, pure and mixed, lived in wealth and luxury. No question of Spanish sovereignty was raised, and over all, the Church had absolute influence. The religious orders grew rich and powerful. The people loved the showy ceremonies of the Church, with its external religion and its congruity of orthodox devotion with any sort of life whatsoever. "The Indians toiling in the cities, on the extensive estates, or in the mines, were apparently devoted to the new faith. Multitudes flocked annually to the sacred shrines, once Pagan, now Romanist. On high feast days, the streets of the cities were bright with splendid religious processions. Massive churches and convents were everywhere to be seen; the cross crowned every hilltop; the clangour of bells was constant."[2]

For three centuries the Church and Spain had undisputed sway over all America south of the Western plains, save a few small possessions of other European Powers and Brazil which belonged to Portugal. If a nation and a religious institution ever had an opportunity to produce their legitimate fruits, such an opportunity was given for these three centuries to Spain and Rome. We have seen the beginnings. What was the end?

The Church has revealed itself. Emotional devotion, exalted above character and principle, brought forth the inevitable result. It had asked no more than a formal acceptance from the people. What Humboldt said of Mexico was true generally, "The introduction of the Romish religion had no other effect upon the Mexicans than to substitute new ceremonies and symbols for the rites of a sanguinary worship. Dogma has not succeeded dogma, but only ceremony to ceremony." Dr. Abbott has spoken more strongly, "Christianity, instead of fulfilling its mission of enlightening, converting and sanctifying the natives, was itself converted; Paganism was baptized; Christianity paganized."[1] This was the result of the Church's supremacy over the natives. It failed to supply any adequate moral check or purification to the Spanish and Portuguese people. It introduced the Inquisition in its worst forms.[2] It supported the intolerance and oppression of the Government. Yet there were great exceptions. It was a priest, Hidalgo, who led in the deliverance of Mexico and another priest, Luis Beltran, who repudiated the orders of his superiors and founded the arsenal where he taught his workmen to melt church-bells for cannon for the army of San Martin, the liberator of the Argentine and Chili. So that though in the main, the Church was naturally on the conservative side, it was not wholly so, and when the revolt came, which first assailed Spain, it for a while endured Rome.

---

[1] Quoted by Brown, *Latin America*, p. 89.

[2] *Ibid*, p. 102.

It was the tyranny of a distant Government that the people first began to question. Spain's attitude towards her colonies was suicidal. They were forbidden to trade with foreign nations or to engage in traffic between the provinces. And innumerable small limitations were laid upon agriculture and commerce. One community was forbidden to plant vines; another to sow flax. One place could not export wines or almonds; another could not build mills. The manifesto of the Constituent Congress of the United Provinces of South America, issued from Buenos Ayres, October 25, 1817, set forth what the liberators held to have been the abuses of Spain. "From the moment when the Spaniards possessed themselves of these countries, they preferred the system of securing their possessions by extermination, destruction and degradation. The plans of this extensive mischief were forthwith carried into effect, and have been continued without any intermission during the space of three hundred years. They began by assassinating the monarchs of Peru and they afterwards did the same with the other chieftains and distinguished men who came in their way. . . . The Spaniards thus placed a barrier to the population of the country. . . . Entire towns have in some places disappeared, either buried in the ruins of mines, or their inhabitants destroyed by the compulsive and poisonous labour of working them. . . . The teaching of science was forbidden us. . . . Commerce has at all times been an exclusive monopoly in the hands of the traders of Spain and the consignees they sent off to America. The public offices were reserved for Spaniards. . . . Among the viceroys who have governed in America, four natives of the country alone are numbered: and 602 captains-general and governors, with the exception of fourteen, all have been Spaniards. . . . Everything was so arranged by Spain that the degradation of the natives should prevail in America. It did not enter into her views that wise men should be formed, fearful that minds and talents would be created capable of promoting the interests of their country and causing civilization, manners, and those excellent capabilities with which the Columbian children are gifted, to make a rapid progress. She increasingly diminished our population, apprehensive that some day or other, it might be in a state to rise against a dominion sustained only by a few hands, to whom the keeping of detached and extensive regions was intrusted. She carried on an exclusive trade because the supposed opulence would make us proud and inclined to free ourselves from outrage. She denied to us the advancement of industry in order that we might be divested of the means of rising out of misery and poverty; and we were excluded from offices of trust in order that Peninsulars only might hold influence in the country and form the necessary habits and inclinations, with a view of leaving us in such a state of dependence as to be unable to think or act, unless according to Spanish forms.

---

[1] Quoted by Butler, *Mexico in Transition*, p. 11.

[2] Butterworth, *South America*, p. 47.

"Such was the system firmly and steadily upheld by the viceroys, each one of whom bore the state and arrogance of a vizier. . . . We held neither direct nor indirect influence in our own legislation: this was instituted in Spain. . . . We were aware that no other resource was left to us than patience, and that for him who was not resigned to endure all, even capital punishment was not sufficient, since for cases of this kind, torments new and of unheard-of cruelty had been invented, such as made nature shudder."

It cannot be denied that this was a temperate statement, as temperate surely as our Declaration of Independence. The wrongs of the British colonies in North America were mild and beneficent in comparison with the wrongs of the Spanish colonies in the South. "It is estimated that the population of the empire of the Incas—Peru, Bolivia and Ecuador—exceeded 10,000,000 at the time of their subjugation, where to-day after four centuries of Spanish and Romish rule, there are not 3,000,000."[1] Captain Basil Hall wrote in his journal in 1823, "The whole purpose for which the South Americans existed was held to be in collecting together precious metals for the Spaniards, and if the wild horses and cattle could have been trained to perform these offices, the inhabitants might have been dispensed with altogether, and then the colony system would have been perfect."[2] The conditions which have become familiar to us in Cuba and the Philippines prevailed all over Central and South America. Spain and Portugal were supreme, and while there was doubtless a great deal of contentment and a form of civilization, it was just a baser expression of the social principles which prevailed in the South before the Civil War, immensely degraded, however, by the autocracy of the Government and the fanaticism and domination of the Church.

Yet it was not the wrongs from which they suffered, which sufficed to arouse the Latin American states to revolution. The Spanish colonies felt the influence of the movement towards liberty then altering the history of Europe and North America. Spain kept them as ignorant as possible of what was going on, but both they and Spain felt that some change in their relations would inevitably follow. Spain recognized the independence of the United States in 1783. How could she continue to deny all autonomy to her own colonies? The Count of Aranda suggested to Charles III, "the reorganization of all his colonial possessions in America, by the establishment of three kingdoms, namely, Mexico, Peru and the Spanish Main, including what is now Venzeuela and Colombia. Over these, members of the Spanish royal family were to be placed as Kings; and the Spanish monarch was to be supreme with the title of Emperor. The scheme was rejected as too chimerical."[3] But by recognizing the right or at least the fact of American independence in the North, Spain was in a weakened position to deny it in the South.

---

[1] *Missionary Review of the World*, November, 1901, p. 857.

[2] See Bigelow, *The Children of the Nations*, pp. 6ff.

[3] Brown, *Latin America*, p. 127.

The people of South America were making comparisons for themselves. The manifesto already quoted proceeds with the statement: "Neither so great nor so repeated were the hardships which roused the provinces of Holland when they took up arms to free themselves from the yoke of Spain; nor those of Portugal to effect the same purpose. Less were the hardships which placed the Swiss under the direction of William Tell and in open opposition to the German Emperor; less those which determined the United States of North America to resist the imposts forced upon them by a British king; less, in short, the powerful motives which have urged other countries, not separated by nature from the parent state, to cast off an iron yoke and consult their own felicity."

Even more than by the revolution of the United States, the South American and Mexican patriots were inspired by the spirit and character of the French Revolution. Bolivar, after finishing his education in Spain, went to Paris and saw there the closing scenes of the Revolution. Later, he returned to Paris and lived there for five years. Subsequently, he returned to Venezuela by way of the United States. But France probably influenced him more than America. Racially, the Latin American people are more in sympathy with France, while temperamentally their whole movement resembles the French Revolution far more than ours. They liked the emotions and principles of it better and we can understand the struggle for the emancipation of South America more readily, if we imagine it as a movement of Frenchmen rather than of Americans.

And curiously and with no intention of his own, the man who made independence possible for the Spanish colonies was Napoleon. "Probably no man exerted a greater influence in promoting the development of liberty and of free institutions on this continent" than he.[1] In 1808, he deposed Ferdinand VII, King of Spain, and put his brother Joseph on the throne. Spain was soon torn by civil war and the stringency of her colonial Government was relaxed. The Government at home was disorganized, and the colonies set up their own Governments, some regarding them as tentative only, to be suspended when Ferdinand should be reinstated; others rejoicing at the opportunity which they afforded of securing entire independence. In 1810, the first declaration of independence was made. The first step was taken in Venezuela. There were three parties there: the imperialists, or Bonapartists, the adherents of Ferdinand, and the liberators, who believed in independence. On April 18, 1810, there arrived at Caracas, the commissioners who announced the formation of a regency at Cadiz and called upon the Venezuelans to be loyal. Bolivar expressed the feeling of the liberators. "This power which fluctuates in such a manner on the Peninsula," he said, "and does not secure itself, invites us to establish the junta of Caracas and be governed by ourselves." On the following day, the junta was proclaimed as an independent power. "It voted not to recognize the regency of Cadiz and announced that Venezuela, in virtue of its natural and political right, would proceed to the formation of a Government of its own."[1] As Minister Romero said, "A condition of things had been reached which made independence a necessity that could not be suppressed, postponed or evaded." In this same year, steps towards independence were taken on May 25th in Buenos Ayres for the Argentine; on July 20th, in Bogota for Colombia; on September 16th, in Mexico; on September 18th, in Santiago for Chili, and "during the same month of September in most of the other colonies."[2]

---

[1] Ellinwood, *Questions and Phases of Foreign Missions*, p. 197.

In some cases, these declarations were put forth as expressive of no disloyalty to Ferdinand, but were on the other hand distinctly friendly to him and designed only to secure from him on his return to power some recognition of rights denied before. On Ferdinand's restoration, however, these hopes were disappointed. As the Manifesto of 1817 from Buenos Ayres declared, "Posterity will be astonished at the ferocity exercised against us by men interested in the preservation of Spanish power in America; and that rashness and folly with which they have sought to punish demonstrations the most evident of fidelity and love, will ever be matters of the greatest surprise. The name of Ferdinand de Bourbon preceded all the decrees of our Government and was at the head of all its public acts. The Spanish flag waved on our vessels and served to animate our soldiers. The provinces, seeing themselves in a bereft state through the overthrow of the national Government, owing to the want of another legitimate and respectable one, substituted in its stead, and the conquest of nearly the whole of the mother country, raised up a watch-tower as it were, within themselves, to attend to their own security and self-preservation, reserving themselves for the captive monarch in case he recovered his freedom. This measure was in imitation of the public conduct of Spain and called forth by the declaration made to America that she was an integral part of the monarchy, and in rights equal with the former; and it had, moreover, been resorted to in Montevideo through the advice of the Spaniards, themselves. We offered to continue pecuniary succours and voluntary donations in order to prosecute the war, and we a thousand times published the soundness of our intentions and the sincerity of our wishes."

---

[1] Butterworth, *South America*, p. 42.

[2] Romero, *Mexico and the United States*, p. 295.

The declaration of the council at Caracas on April 19, 1810, the first of all the actual steps towards independence, was to the effect that the Government to be formed would exercise authority in the name of Ferdinand VII, pending his restoration to the throne.

Nothing would satisfy Spain, however, but the re-establishment of her complete and autocratic authority. The mediation of Great Britain in behalf of the colonies was refused. "The Spanish ministers," said the patriots in 1817, "blinded by their sanguinary caprice, spurned the mediation and issued rigorous orders to all their generals to push the war and to inflict heavier punishments. On every side, scaffolds were raised and recourse was had to every invention for spreading consternation and dismay. . . . In the town of Valle-Grande, they enjoyed the brutal pleasure of cutting off the ears of the inhabitants and sent off baskets filled with these presents to their headquarters. . . . They have not only been cruel and implacable in murdering, but they have also divested themselves of all morality and public decency, by whipping old religious persons in the open squares and also women bound to a cannon, causing them previously to be stripped and exposed to shame and derision. . . . They have declared that the laws of war observed among civilized nations ought not to be practiced among us; and their General Pezuela, after the battle of Ayouma, in order to avoid any compromise or understanding, had the arrogance to answer General Belgrano that with insurgents it was impossible to enter into treaties. Such has been the conduct of Spaniards towards us since the restoration of Ferdinand de Bourbon to the throne of his ancestors. We then believed that the termination of so many sufferings and disasters had arrived. We had supposed that a king, schooled by the lessons of adversity, would not be indifferent to the desolation of his people, and we sent out a commissioner to him in order to acquaint him with our situation. We could not for a moment conceive that he would fail to meet our wishes as a benign prince, nor could we doubt that our requests would interest him in a manner corresponding to that gratitude and goodness which the courtiers of Spain had extolled to the skies. But a new and unknown species of ingratitude was reserved for America, surpassing all the examples found in the histories of the greatest tyrants."

The same justification of their course was advanced by the Venezuelan patriots in their declaration of complete independence on July 5, 1811. "At a time that we, faithful to our promise, were sacrificing our security and civil dignity not to abandon the rights which we generously presented to Ferdinand of Bourbon, we have seen that, to the relation of force which bound him to the Emperor of the French, he had added the ties of blood and friendship, in consequence of which, even the Governments of Spain have already declared their resolution to acknowledge him conditionally.

"In this mournful alternative, we have remained three years in a state of political indecision and ambiguity, so fatal and dangerous that this alone would suffice to authorize the resolution which the faith of our promises and bonds of fraternity had caused us to defer till necessity was obliged to go beyond what we at first proposed, impelled by the hostile and unnatural conduct of the Governments of Spain, which have disburdened us from our conditional oath, by which circumstance we are called to the august representation we now exercise. . . .

"We, therefore, in the name and by the will and authority which we hold for the virtuous people of Venezuela, do declare solemnly to the world that its United Provinces are and ought to be from this day, by act and right, free, sovereign and independent States; and that they are absolved from any submission and dependence on the throne of Spain, or on those who do or may call themselves its agents and representatives."

This was the first formal and unqualified assertion of independence. It was the first act in the great movement which delivered northern South America from the sovereignty of Spain. The great hero of the movement in the north was Simon Bolivar, who was born in Caracas in 1783. Bolivar was preceded, however, by Francisco Miranda who was born in 1756 and who dreamed the dream of independence and strove to realize it before its time. He passed on his vision and his spirit to Bolivar but died in prison, where Bolivar and some fellow-patriots had placed him. It was under Bolivar's leadership that the independence of Venezuela was declared at Caracas. After many vicissitudes the victory of Boyaca on August 7, 1819, enabled him to proclaim on December 17, 1819, the Republic of Colombia consisting of Venezuela and New Granada, the latter of which in 1858 became the United States of Colombia, a separate republic, reverting thus to the independence secured during the disturbed days before Venezuela had actually secured her liberty. On June 24, 1821, he gained the decisive victory of Carabobo which ended the Spanish power in the new combined republic, and the same year, he was elected its president.

In the south meanwhile, a similar movement was going on. Argentine took advantage of the unsettled conditions in Spain to set up its own provisional government and on January 31, 1813, a congress assembled in Buenos Ayres and elected Posadas, Dictator. On July 9, 1816, independence was formally declared. Of the great characters who won freedom for the south, San Martin stands out foremost. Having taken a prominent part in the emancipation of Buenos Ayres, he turned his attention westward and planned for the deliverance of Chili and Peru. From his position as Governor of the Province of Cuzco he marched over the Andes into Chili and at Maipo on April 5, 1818, fought the battle against the royalists, which freed Chili. His next step was a naval expedition. Commanded by Lord Cochrane, a British Admiral, his fleet sailed from Valparaiso and San Martin entered Lima. On July 28, 1821, Peru declared her independence.

These two delivering movements met at Guayaquil in 1822 when Bolivar and San Martin came together and conferred over their great plan to deliver the whole of South America. San Martin believed that his work was now done; that Bolivar could accomplish the liberation of the western regions better alone, so he quietly withdrew.

"The presence of a fortunate general in the country which he has conquered is detrimental to the state," he said. "I have achieved the independence of Peru. I cease to be a public man." Whereupon, he crossed the Andes, took his daughter with him to Europe and lived there in poverty and neglect.[1]

Midway between the movement of deliverance in the north and the movement in the south, was the work of deliverance done by Sucre in Ecuador and Peru. At the battle of Pichincha on May 24, 1822, he destroyed the Spanish power in Ecuador, the new republic joining the republic of Colombia. On December 9, 1824, with Bolivar, he fought the great battle of Ayacucho against the Spanish viceroy La Serna and finally destroyed the authority of Spain. The provinces of Upper Peru which were thus freed and which had theoretically been part of the Argentine Republic as successor to the vice-royalty of Buenos Ayres, were now organized into an independent republic under the name of Bolivia.

The course of the struggle in the smaller states of South America it is not necessary to follow. It is necessary to speak only of Brazil. Before doing so, it is worth recalling that the patriots who won the liberties of South America from Spain almost without exception died tragic and ungrateful deaths. "The first revolutionists of La Paz and of Quito," says General Mitre, "died on the scaffold. Miranda, the apostle of liberty, betrayed by his own people to his enemies, died, alone and naked in a dungeon. Moreno, the priest of the Argentine revolution, and the teacher of the Democratic idea, died at sea, and found a grave in the ocean. Hidalgo, the first popular leader of Mexico, was executed as a criminal. Belgrano, the first champion of Argentine independence, who saved the revolution at Tucuman and Salta, died obscurely while civil war raged around him. O'Higgins, the hero of Chili, died in exile as Carrera, his rival, had done before him. Iturbide the real liberator of Mexico, fell a victim to his own ambition. Montufar, the leader of the revolution in Quito and his comrade Villavicencio, the promoter of that of Cartagena, were strangled. The first presidents of New Granada, Lozano and Torres, fell sacrifices to the restoration of colonial terrorism. Piar, who founded the true base for the insurrection of Colombia was shot by Bolivar, to whom he had shown the way to victory. Rivadavia, the civil genius of South America, who gave form to her representative institutions died in exile. Sucre, the conqueror of Ayacucho, was murdered by his own men on a lonely road. Bolivar and San Martin died in banishment." [1]

---

[1] Butterworth, *South America*, pp. 137f.

The course of affairs in Brazil was peculiar and distinct. Brazil was not Spanish but Portuguese. At the time that the Spanish colonies were breaking loose from the mother country through the weakness and want of control of the latter, the mother country came to Brazil. The Prince Regent fled to Brazil from Portugal in 1808 to save his crown from Napoleon. In Brazil, John V adopted a more liberal policy and raised the colony to coördinate rank with the mother country. But the will to be free could not be repressed and in 1821, the people demanded a constitution and the following year set up an independent empire with a son of John VI as Emperor under the title of Dom Pedro I. In 1889, without bloodshed, the empire gave place to the republic. [2]

In sharpest contrast was the history of the establishment of constitutional Government in Mexico. The struggle began with two priests, Hidalgo and Morelos. Hidalgo commenced the long conflict when he rang the bell of the parish church on September 16, 1810, and led out his flock in revolt against the oppression of a Government which had taken offence at his interest in his people and at the industry with which they had taken up, under his guidance, the culture of the vine and silk-worm, the making of porcelain and other small enterprises, and which had ordered the destruction of all the new industries. Under Morelos' leadership, a constitutional convention was called and in October, 1814, a constitution was framed and proclaimed.[3] Hidalgo and Morelos were soon executed but the spirit they represented could not die. It was proposed that Ferdinand VII should follow the example of John VI of Portugal and come to Mexico to set up his throne there. When such plans failed, Iturbide who had command of the viceroy's army issued a "Plan," the first article of which declared, "The Mexican nation is independent of the Spanish nation and of every other, even on its own continent," and on February 24, 1821, the Spanish flag, "after having floated for just 300 years," was hauled down forever. Iturbide attempted to play the Emperor, but on his fall, a republic was established under a constitution in 1824. Guatemala and the Central American provinces soon followed and the American continent, barring its islands was independent of all Roman Catholic powers.

---

[1] Butterworth, *South America*, p. 151.

[2] Vincent, *Around and About South America*, Ch. XXX.

[3] Butler, *Mexico in Transition*, pp. 67–71.

But it was not independent of the Roman Catholic Church. The movement of emancipation had been political and had explicitly disavowed any hostility to the Church which was so closely identified with Spain and Portugal as political forces. The Venezuelan declaration of independence stated that in asserting independence, the people ratified their desire "of believing and defending the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Religion of Jesus Christ." It was indicative of the powerful hold the Church had upon the minds of the people that they protested loyalty to the Church and refused to include her in their opposition to Spain and their assertion of freedom, in spite of the fact that she had been used as a powerful repressive agency against them and that her influence and the influence of her priests had been almost wholly on the royalist side. As the Argentine manifesto asserted of the Spanish course, "They propagated against us atrocious calumnies, attributing to us the design of destroying our sound religion, of setting aside all morality and establishing licentiousness of manners. They carried on a war of religion against us, devising many and various plots to agitate and alarm the consciences of the people, by causing the Spanish bishops to issue edicts of ecclesiastical censure and interdiction among the faithful, to publish excommunications and by means of some ignorant confessors, to sow fanatical doctrines in the tribunal of penance. By the aid of such religious discords, they have sown dissension." In spite of all this, the new Republics protested their devotion to the Church and without exception declared the Roman Catholic Church to be the established Church and interdicted all others. There were, however, discussions as to the propriety of denying freedom of religion and Bolivar himself, addressing the Venezuelan Congress in 1819, expressed regret that the new constitution forbade religious liberty and said, "No religious creed or profession should be prescribed in a political constitution."

The new republics soon discovered that in freeing themselves from the Roman Catholic Powers, they had not secured their liberty. The

Church was still with them and its radical hostility to free institutions which had been unperceived during the disturbances of war now began to reveal itself. Political parties formed themselves on the issue of progress and liberty or conservatism and Latin Catholicism. The conservative parties got the name of "clericals."[1] Questions arose as to the appointment of bishops. Should the right, formerly exercised by the Spanish Government, be exercised by the new Governments or revert to the Church? The Church and religious orders were immensely wealthy. Questions of taxation arose. Were the religious orders to be exempt? Should the Church be allowed to roll in wealth, while poverty oppressed the Government, to which, under constitutional principles with an established Church, the Church owed everything? Under free institutions, moreover, men began to think freely. They learned more of the world and by comparison came to understand more clearly the real character and corruption of the Church. They saw also that their free institutions were doomed unless they secured them not only against Spain and Portugal, but also against a far more subtle and powerful foe, even Rome itself. Mexico, as the most enlightened of the new Republics, faced the issue first. She felt its reality in her own situation. As Mr. Wilson wrote in 1854, "In place of the Inquisition, which the reformed Spanish Government took away from the Church of Mexico, the Church now wields the power of wealth, almost fabulous in amount. . . . The influence of the Archbishop, as the substantial owner of nearly half of the property in the city of Mexico gives him a power over his tenants unknown under our system of laws. . . . Besides this, a large portion of the Church property is money, and the Archbishop is the great loan and trust company in Mexico, nor is this power by any means an insignificant one. A bankrupt Government is overawed by it."[2] Maximilian, himself, issued a manifesto to the Church in which he said, "Confess, my well esteemed prelates, that the Mexican Church, by a lamentable fatality has mingled too much in politics and in affairs of temporal possessions, neglecting in consequence the Catholic instruction of its flocks." The long struggle in Mexico for liberty from Spain and then from Europe ended at last in independence politically and also religiously from

---

[1] Rankin, *Twenty Years Among the Mexicans*, p. 75.

[2] Wilson, *Mexico*, p. 323.

Rome, when on February 5, 1867, a new constitution was issued which provided for freedom of religion.

Sooner or later the same issue arose in each of the new states, the Republics striving for a healthy development in freedom and the wholesome privilege of enlightened self-government and the Church as constantly throwing her influence against such development and in favour of mediævalism, popular ignorance and ecclesiastical autocracy. In 1852, the Pope denounced the movement in New Granada towards religious liberty, which decreed the expulsion of the Jesuits, a curtailment of Church revenues, free education, freedom of the press and freedom of public and private worship. These "nefarious decrees," the Pope condemned and declared to be "null and void." In October, 1864, Pius IX wrote to Maximilian, "Your majesty is well aware that in order effectively to repair the evil occasioned by the revolution and to bring back as soon as possible happy days for the Church, the Catholic religion must above all things, continue to be the glory and mainstay of the Mexican nation to the exclusion of every other dissenting worship; that the bishops must be perfectly free in the exercise of their pastoral ministry; that the religious orders should be re-established or re-organized, that no person may obtain the faculty of teaching false and subversive tenets; that instruction, whether public or private, should be directed and watched over by the ecclesiastical authority, and that in short the chains may be broken which up to the present time have held the Church in a state of self-dependence and subject to the arbitrary rule of civil Government."[1] In December of the same year, the Pope issued an encyclical addressed to all "patriarchs, primates, archbishops and bishops in connection with the apostolic see throughout the world," in which he set forth the following positions:

1. The Catholic Church ought fully to exercise until the end of time a "salutary force, not only with regard to each individual man, but with regard to nations, peoples and their rulers."

2. The best condition of society is that in which the power of the laity is compelled to inflict the penalties of law upon violators of the Catholic religion.

---

[1] Lefévre, *History of the French Intervention in Mexico*, Vol. II, p. 16; Appleton's *Universal Cyclopedia*, 1865, p. 749; Quoted by Butler, *Mexico in Transition*, p. 180.

3. The opinion that "liberty of conscience and of worship is the right of every man," is not only "an erroneous opinion, very hurtful to the safety of the Catholic Church and of souls," but is also "delirious."

4. Liberty of speech and the press is "the liberty of perdition."

5. The judgments of the Holy See, even when they do not speak of faith and morals, claim acquiescence and obedience, under pain of sin and loss of the Catholic profession.

6. It is false to say "that every man is free to embrace and profess the religion he shall believe true," or that those who "embrace and profess any religion may obtain eternal salvation."

7. The "Church has the power of availing herself of force, or of direct or indirect temporal power."

8. In a legal conflict "between the ecclesiastical and civil powers," the ecclesiastics "ought to prevail."

9. It is a false and pernicious doctrine that "public schools should be opened without distinction to all children of the people and free from all ecclesiastical authority."

10. It is false to say that the "principle of non-intervention must be proclaimed and observed."

11. It is necessary in the present day that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the state to the exclusion of all other modes of worship.[1]

The American Republics were gradually forced to recognize, accordingly, that the establishment of the Roman Catholic Church as the exclusive Church meant the deliberate rejection of those agencies and institutions of liberty, without which they could call their states republics, but could not call their people free. And one by one they have been denying the autocracy of Rome as they denied at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the autocracy of Spain. The only South American States whose laws still exclude all public worship except the Roman Catholic, are Peru and Bolivia. "A woman was formally burnt to death by priests in Peru only a few years ago, and two others were subsequently threatened with the same fate—all for disobedience to ecclesiastical authority.[2] The Inquisition was not abolished in these two lands till 1821 and "as late as 1836, the penalty was death for holding any worship other than the Roman Catholic in Bolivia and Peru."[1] In the Argentine, there is now free toleration of Protestantism,[2] and in 1884 President Roca made a speech at a Protestant anniversary celebration in Buenos Ayres, in which he praised the missionaries, saying that to their influence he attributed much of the progress of the republic and urged them to enlarge their fields and increase their zeal.

---

[1] Butler, *Mexico in Transition*, pp. 197f., quoting Encyclical from *The Christian Advocate*, New York, 1865.

[2] *Protestant Missions in South America*, p. 158.

In Chili full religious toleration has been guaranteed and in 1888, the Government granted the Presbyterian Mission a charter, stating that "those who profess the Reformed Church religion according to the doctrines of Holy Scripture may promote primary and superior instruction, according to modern methods and practices and propagate the worship of their belief, obedient to the laws of the land." The Church of Rome naturally still has its special privileges and has retained immense wealth. "Its property in Santiago alone is said to be worth more than $100,000,000 in gold. It owns some of the best business blocks in the city. The whole of one side of the Plaza, which is the centre as well as the most valuable of Santiago business property, is taken up by the palace of the Archbishop and the Cathedral and there is other property in the neighbourhood which belongs to the Church. It has acres of stores, thousands of rented houses and vast haciendas, upon which wines and other products are manufactured and offered for sale. Nearly all is controlled by the Archbishop, although much of the church property is held by the different organizations. The Carmelite nuns of Santiago are the richest body of women in South America, if not in the world."[3] "The state also makes appropriations from the public funds for the support of the parish clergy and of Church schools and for the erection of churches."[4]

In Brazil, the fifth article of the Constitution of the Empire provided, "The Roman Catholic shall continue to be the one established religion of the State; all other religions shall however be tolerated with their special worship in private houses, and in houses designated for the purpose, without the exterior form of a temple." The Constitution of the Republic guarantees perfect religious liberty and freedom of worship and debars no man from any office because of his religious belief. There has been of late, however, a great ultramontane revival. Many of the Spanish priests expelled from the Philippines by the rebellion there, came to Brazil and the Church has apparently rekindled its purpose to dominate the land.

---

[1] *Protestant Missions in South America*, p. 148.

[2] Carpenter, *South America*, p. 315.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 228.

[4] *Protestant Missions in South America*, p. 136.

> "During the first year of the present president of the republic, Campos Salles, the Jesuits have received more concessions than during the other nine years of the republic's history," wrote Dr. H. S. Allyn, in *The Missionary*, in 1900. "Upon the return of the Brazilian bishops from the Latin-American Council in Rome, they published an encyclical from Leo XIII granting permission for the priests to take active part in politics, and ordering the bishops to give greater attention to the education of the priests, especially in regard to political affairs, which indicated a plan to secure control of the Government. As one of the results of this interference of the priests, all of the Protestants have been disfranchised in the election for federal senators and representatives by the law recently passed ordering this election to take place on the last Sunday of the year, for no one who fears the Lord can engage in such a business on His day. Another result is the turning over to the tender mercies of the monks, the Government insane asylum and house of correction for boys, in direct opposition to the constitution and laws of the land. When the Archbishop of Rio returned from Rome, he was met by an official representative of the President, who ordered the State carriage to carry him to the church, where he said mass, with a military escort in procession through a street never opened for carriages except upon State occasions, the music for the mass being furnished by military bands, yet the constitution distinctly says that the Federal Government and every State Government shall have no relations whatever with any Church." [1]

There is even greater carelessness in Argentine. "In Buenos Ayres, the elections are held on Sundays in the porches of the Churches." [2]

The liberating movement in South America contains many surprises. A republic which has taken under liberal guidance, advanced ground on questions of freedom of religion and free education, may under clerical control reverse all its progress, while a state which has been dominated by the Church in the most degrading way may suddenly break through its enslavement into liberty. Colombia illustrates the former course and Ecuador the latter.

---

[1] From an article entitled "The Seminary, the Plague, and the Jesuits," by Dr. Allyn, in *The Missionary*, February, 1900.

[2] Carpenter, *South America*, p. 358.

In 1888, President Arthur sent to South America as a special commissioner, Mr. W. E. Curtis to investigate the conditions prevailing, with reference, of course, to the prospects of trade. This was the judgment he formed of Ecuador: "The priests had such a hold upon the people, that liberty could not live in an atmosphere which they polluted and the country lapsed into a state of anarchy which has continued ever since. . . . It is the only country in America in which the Romish Church survives as the Spaniards left it. . . . The rule which prevails everywhere that the less a people are under the control of that Church, the better their prosperity, enlightenment and progress is illustrated in Ecuador with striking force. One-fourth of all the property in Ecuador belongs to the Bishop. There is a Catholic Church for every 150 inhabitants; of the population of the country, ten per cent. are priests, monks or nuns, and 272 of the 365 days of the year are observed as feast or fast days. The priests control the Government in all its branches, dictate its laws and govern their enforcement and rule the country as absolutely as if the Pope were its king. . . . Until the influence of the Romish Church is destroyed, until emigration is invited and secured, Ecuador will be a desert rich in undeveloped resources. With plenty of natural wealth, it has neither peace nor industry and such a thing as a surplus of any character is unknown. One of the richest of the South American Republics and the oldest of them all, it is the poorest and most backward."[1] This was the condition of affairs until 1895. There could be no hope of evangelical mission work in such a land. Since 1895, however, a complete change has taken place. "Ecuador," wrote the Rev. T. B. Wood, D. D., for more than thirty years a missionary in South America, on February 25, 1902, "is surpassing all other South American countries in the speed of its new progress. As late as 1895, its constitution excluded all worship but the Roman Catholic absolutely. Now it ensures full religious liberty. Then the civil power was subject to a concordat with the Pope, making it practically subordinate to the ecclesiastical power. Now all ecclesiastical functionaries, from the primate down are subalterns of the Government. Then all ecclesiastical property belonged wholly to the ecclesiastical authorities. Now, it belongs to boards of trustees appointed by the civil authorities and subject to the civil power. Then, the school laws allowed none but Catholics to teach in any kind of school, or even give private lessons. Now, a Methodist Presiding Elder is commissioned to organize the new system of normal schools, whose directors are all Protestants, and whose basal principles, defined in executive decrees, are the great principles common to evangelical Protestants and evangelical Catholics. Then the Customs House confiscated Bibles and evangelical books presented for importation and a high official declared that so it should be while Mount Chimborazo stood in its place. Since then, tons of Bibles have been carried over the shoulders of Mount Chimborazo and colportage is compassing the whole land. Then, both Houses of Congress contained priests and prelates as the ruling elements. Now, all ecclesiastics are ineligible for Congress. Then, the Senate expelled a liberal because he had been excommunicated. Now, at the last session of Congress, the Senate rejected proposals towards reconciling Church and State, after they had been agreed to by the executive and confirmed by the Pope, and the Lower House passed a marriage law, putting Protestants and Catholics on exact equality. No other country in South America is making, or ever has made, such rapid progress as this." [1]

---

[1] Curtis, *Capitals of South America*, p. 306.

The political temper of the better administrators in South America and the spirit of the Church with which they have to deal are illustrated in the following letter of President Plaza of Ecuador to the Archbishop of Quito:

QUITO, November 29, 1902.

To Sr. Pedro Rafael Gonzales Calixto, Archbishop of Quito.

Illustrious Sir: I have carefully read the esteemed favour of your Grace dated the 24th inst., which I proceed to answer. Your Grace is not ignorant of the fact that, at the time when I assumed the executive authority, the Ecuadorian Church was suffering the inevitable consequences of civil war, even when it could not be forgotten that the policy of General Alfaro went to the extreme of tolerance with respect to the clergy, who showed themselves adverse and uncompromising during his whole administration. Be that as it may, it is true that in the first acts of my administration, I proceeded to offer full guarantees to the enemies of the Liberal party, disburse the funds assigned to the worship and to the clergy, which had been practically suppressed, for which reason the vicars, bishops, and the greater part of the canons, until then, refugees scattered abroad from their parishes, returned to occupy their positions and enjoy their honours and incomes in tranquillity. The recompense for such positive benefits, as you, honoured sir, are well aware, has been rebellion against the law, and a destructive and evidently revolutionary propaganda. Then how could my government remain satisfied with the hostile attitude taken by the clergy?

---

[1] Letter published in *South American Magazine*, May, 1902, p. 116; see article "Ecuador, the Republic of the Sacred Heart," *Missionary Review*, November, 1901, pp. 808–814; Vincent, *Around and About South America*, p. 33; Carpenter, *South America*, p. 71.

The executive authorities do not consider that the officials of the Ecuadorian Church should compel the faithful to conform to the civil marriage law for the simple reason that, not to the priests, but to the civil officers, it is assigned to require all Ecuadorians and all foreigners residing in Ecuador, to submit to and obey our laws, but I consider that your Grace and the other high dignitaries of the national clergy, far from leading and fomenting rebellion and discord, far from organizing resistance, ought to advise Catholics to perform the duty from which no Catholics can escape, be they Ecuadorian or foreign residents. That is to say, they ought to be inspired by the lofty example of Leo XIII, when that wise and prudent pontiff advised the French clergy and people to submit to the laws of France.

Your Grace informs me that you have ordered the parish priests to go on performing marriages among their parishioners as before, until instructions are received from Rome; to which there could be no objection since the Government does not propose to meddle with those affairs which have to do with ceremonies and discipline of the Church, if the terms in which your Grace expressed yourself had not clearly indicated an absolute contempt for the nation and its institutions, and if the order given to the parish priests had not unfortunately gone even to the extent of ordering the violation of a law of the Republic.

Altogether and for the purpose of avoiding greater evils, for the sake of peace, under whose protecting wings all Ecuadorians should unite in order to work in one way or another for the building up and the integrity of our country; in order to take away this, as a rock of scandal in the way of order, and to set aside this frivolous pretext, tenaciously plead by those who, conspiring against the established régime, intend to involve us again in the innumerable horrors of a fratricidal war; in order to offer to the obstinate and most intolerant, an undeniable proof of the truly patriotic and conciliatory spirit that pervades all; in order to show the friendly deference to your Grace and the illustrious bishops of Ibarra and Riobamba, whom I so highly esteem, I should not hesitate to avoid danger and, exposing myself to bitter censure, suspend the law of civil marriage passed by the last congress, thus satisfying the sincere desire that has always animated the State, of moving in harmony and accord with the Church; if there had been some provision which authorized the executive to suspend the enforcement of a law already in effect; but now, since it is my duty to execute the constitutional laws, an effort to please your Grace would have made me responsible for an attempt which would have compromised the honour of my government, especially as we are dealing with a law for which the public waits with intense expectancy.

Unfortunately our statutes do not sanction the laudable proposition of your Grace, and I find myself deprived of the pleasure of pleasing such distinguished prelates. On the contrary, therefore, there remains only one lawful recourse: that of submission to the law as long as it is not legally modified or repealed.

Your Grace knows, as well as I, that the Government of Ecuador does not depend on any foreign power, and that the laws of the Republic do not await the sanction of Rome—a fact which does not hinder your Grace, if you desire to consult the Holy See with the plausible intention of avoiding a conflict, from communicating by cable with the Vatican, assured that the wisdom of Leo XIII will not unjustly make an exception of our little State, and that he will have no objection to allowing our Catholics to obey a law which has been established in Europe since the eighteenth century; which for one hundred years has been part of the legal rights of France; and which, preceding Ecuador, all enlightened people where Christianity reigns, have accepted with favour.

In order to terminate this letter, I desire to respectfully warn your Grace that if civil war should take place, the guilt would be only upon those who organize a campaign of resistance to the national laws, and upon them will fall the responsibility of the Ecuadorian blood which will be shed. I can assure your Grace that the first shots will not come from the ranks of the Government, but the last ones certainly will.

With feelings of the highest consideration and signal appreciation, I have the privilege of signing myself, Illustrious Archbishop,

Your most attentive and obedient servant,
LEONIDAS PLAZA.[1]

The *Gospel Message* which printed this letter said in its issue of June, 1903,

> "Some had feared that the new President would not be favourable to Gospel work, but our missionaries still have great privileges under General Plaza, and he seems to hold a strong hand on the disturbing clerical elements. He has given definite orders to the authorities to allow our workers the privilege of preaching on the streets and carrying on their work in hospitals, jails and army barracks in the various parts of the Republic. A rigid civil-marriage law has been passed, and went into effect January 1, 1903. All these things represent a weakening of the political power of the papal Church."

How easily constitutional guarantees may be overthrown, however, where the Church is always an issue, or if not an issue, a power in politics, and where one of the political parties is usually controlled in its interest is shown by the history of Colombia. The following statement was prepared by one who was long resident in Colombia and who has watched the development of affairs for years:

---

[1] Quoted in *The Gospel Message*, January, 1903.

I

"In 1863, Colombia adopted a Constitution that embodied in its fundamental provisions the principles of modern liberty, granting religious, educational, literary and commercial freedom, but the lack of a form of Government sufficiently centralized to defend itself occasioned its downfall, and in 1886, after another revolution the Liberal Constitution was abolished, and the one that is actually the organic law of the land was adopted. The articles that bear upon the subject of religious liberty read as follows:

"'Art. 38. The Roman Catholic Apostolic Religion is that of the nation. The public authorities shall protect it, and cause it to be respected as the essential element of social order.

"'It is understood that the Catholic Church is not and shall not be official, and it shall preserve its independence.

"'Art. 39. No one shall be molested on account of his religious opinions, nor compelled by the authorities to profess beliefs or to observe practices contrary to his conscience.

"'Art. 40. The exercise of all worship that may not be contrary to Christian morals or to the laws is permitted.

"'Acts contrary to Christian morals or subversive of public order which may be occasioned under the pretext of worship, shall be judged by the common law.

"'Art. 41. Public education shall be organized and directed in accord with the Catholic Religion. Primary education at public expense shall be free but not obligatory.

"'Art. 56. The Government may make concordats with the Holy Apostolic See for the purpose of arranging the pending questions and defining and establishing relations between the civil and ecclesiastical powers.'

"These are the chief constitutional provisions that bear on the subject and at first sight they seem to grant all that can be rightly claimed on behalf of dissenters from the religion that is said to be that of the nation. Especially Articles 39 and 40 seem to grant the very principle above defined as religious liberty, and were it not for the influence of the privileges granted to the Roman Catholic Church in the other articles, and the use that is made of them, religious liberty would exist in Colombia.

"In addition, the treaty between the United States and Colombia grants a well-defined liberty to the citizens of the United States resident in Colombia. Art. 14 reads:

"'The citizens of the United States residing in the territory of the Republic of New Granada (now Colombia) shall enjoy the most perfect and entire security of conscience, without being annoyed, prevented or disturbed on account of their religious beliefs. Neither shall they be annoyed, molested or disturbed in the proper exercise of their religion in private houses or in chapels or places of worship appointed for that purpose, provided that in so doing they observe the decorum due to divine worship and the respect due the laws, usages and customs of the country. Liberty shall also be granted to bury the citizens of the United States that may die in the territories of the Republic of New Granada in convenient and adequate places to be appointed and established by themselves for that purpose, with the knowledge of the local authorities or in such other places of sepulture as may be chosen by the friends of the deceased, nor shall the funerals or sepulchres of the dead be disturbed in any wise nor upon any account.'

"With these clear statements in the organic law of the land, and in the treaties (for the Treaty with England is in almost the same words as that with the United States), it would seem that there could be no doubt that the spirit of religious liberty was firmly established in Colombia, but we shall see how far it has been modified by subsequent developments growing out of the intimate relations acquired with the Roman Catholic religion and Church.

II

"In accord with the power granted to the Government by Art. 56 of the Constitution, Colombia entered into a concordat with the Pope of Rome, which was approved by the Government on February 27, 1888, and of which the following are some of the chief provisions:

"Art. 1 recognizes the Roman Catholic Religion as that of Colombia, and obliges the Government to protect it, and cause it to be respected, in all its rights.

"Art. 2 reads: 'The Catholic Church shall preserve its full liberty and independence of the civil power, and consequently without any intervention from the civil power, it can exercise freely all its spiritual authority and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and conform its own government to its own laws.'

"Art. 3 provides 'The canonic legislation is independent of the civil law and forms no part of it; but it shall be solemnly respected by all the authorities of the Republic.'

"Arts. 4, 5 and 6 grant the Church the right to hold property.

"Art. 7 exempts the clergy from civil and military duty.

"Art. 8 reads: 'The Government is obliged to adopt in the laws of criminal procedure dispositions that will save the priestly dignity, whenever for any motive a minister of the Church may have to figure in a process.'

"Art. 9 grants to the Church the right to collect by law, dues, etc., from the faithful to whom service is rendered.

"Arts. 10 and 11 allow the Church to freely establish religious orders and to govern them according to its own regulations, and pledge the Church to co-operate with the Government in works of charity, education and missions.

"In regard to the provisions of this concordat, so far as we have noticed them here, it is evident that they bear on the question of religious liberty only so far as they may grant to the Church the right to curtail, or may lead the Government to curtail, the rights granted to dissidents in the Constitution, or may impede the Government in carrying out the fundamental ideas upon which civil Government is based. In the sequel of this article we shall see some of the practical results of this natural union of the ecclesiastical and the civil power. At least two other items in the concordat bear on this question of religious liberty, and they will be given entire.

"Arts. 12, 13 and 14 refer to the subject of education, and read as follows:

"'In universities, colleges, schools and other centres of instruction public education and instruction shall be organized and directed in conformity with the dogmas and morals of the Catholic religion. Religious instruction is obligatory in these centres, and the pious practices of the Catholic religion shall be observed in them. Consequently in such centres of education, the respective diocesan authorities, either themselves or by means of special delegates, shall exercise the right of inspection and revision of text-books, in all that refers to religion and morals. The Archbishop of Bogota shall designate the books that are to serve as texts of religion and morals in the universities; and with the object of securing uniformity of instruction in the said matters, this Prelate in accord with the other diocesan authorities, shall elect the text-books for the other establishments of official instruction. The Government shall impede the propagation of ideas contrary to Catholic dogma and to the respect and veneration due to the Church in the instruction given in literary and scientific as well as in all other branches of education. In case that the instruction in religion and morals, in spite of the orders and preventions of the Government, shall not be conformed to Catholic doctrines, the diocesan authorities can deprive the professors and teachers of their right to give instruction in these matters.'

"This provision of the concordat places the public schools in all their branches in the hands of the Catholic Church; and it also makes it almost impossible for any one except a Catholic to secure a position in any branch as a teacher or in any school supported by the State. The bearing of this on schools conducted by dissenters will be noticed in the sequel.

"Arts. 17, 18 and 19 refer to marriage and read as follows:

"'Marriages to be celebrated by those who profess the Catholic religion will produce civil effects in regard to the persons and property of the contracting parties only when celebrated in accord with the disposition of the Council of Trent. A civil officer, to be determined by the law, shall be present at the celebration of marriages, only for the purpose of verifying the inscription of the marriage in the civil register, except in the cases of marriage, "in articulo mortis," when this formality may be dispensed with, if not easy to comply with, and the lack shall be replaced by other evidence. It is the duty of the contracting parties to secure the intervention of the civil officer for the purpose of registering the marriage, and the duty of the priest is limited to notifying the parties of the obligation the civil law imposes on them. In regard to marriages celebrated at any time in accord with the dispositions of the Council of Trent and that should produce civil effects, the proofs of ecclesiastical origin shall be admitted before all others. The ecclesiastical authorities shall have exclusive control of matrimonial questions that affect the bond of marriage, the cohabitation of the parties as well as those that refer to the validity of promises of marriage. The civil effects of marriage shall be governed by the civil law.'

"If there should be any doubt on the subject of the binding effect of the concordat on the Republic of Colombia, it would be set at rest by the last provision, which reads:

"'Art. 32. By the present concordat, all laws, orders and decrees, which at any time, or in any manner may have been issued, are hereby derogated and abrogated in the part that may contradict or oppose this agreement whose force in future shall be firm as a law of the State.'

III

"The last article quoted from the concordat shows that its provisions are now incorporated in the legislation of Colombia, and if any one should be in doubt in regard to what the supreme authority of the Church would wish to incorporate in the laws of other countries, if it could be done, some information may be secured from what it has placed in the laws of Colombia; for example, the exclusive right of Romanism to recognition by the civil power, the complete independence of the Papal hierarchy, its complete control over education, science and literature, and its absolute control over marriage. The Government of Colombia, of course, submitted to these requirements and in attempting to carry them out had to adopt laws, issue orders, and make regulations that are striking commentaries on the tendencies of these principles.

"*Marriage.* The marriage laws of any country, of course, bear directly on the question of religious liberty in that country, and while there is a civil marriage law in Colombia for dissenters from the Roman Catholic Church, the validity of the marriage celebrated under the civil law is exposed to be destroyed at any time by either of the parties. The same may be said in regard to a marriage contract under the laws of the United States, if the said marriage should not have been in accord with the provisions of the Council of Trent, and the parties live in Colombia.

"Colombian Law No. 30, of the year 1888, contains the following articles:

"'Art. 34. Marriage contracted in conformity with the rites of the Catholic religion annuls "ipso jure" the purely civil marriage contracted before by the parties with other persons.

"'Art. 35. For merely civil effects the law recognizes the legitimacy of the children conceived before a civil marriage is annulled in virtue of the provision of the previous article.

"'Art. 36. The man who having been married civilly, afterwards marries another woman according to the rites of the Catholic religion, is obliged to furnish proper support to the first woman and the children had by her so long as she does not marry according to the Catholic rite.'

"It may be seen by a careful examination of the provisions of the concordat and of this law, bearing on the subject of marriage, that the whole matter is placed in the hands of the Catholic Church, and as the canonic legislation that applies to countries wholly Catholic is in force in Colombia, the only marriage possible for non-Catholics is the civil rite, and such a marriage is canonically considered as a state of concubinage, that ought to be dissolved at once and that forms no impediment to a subsequent marriage of either of the parties by the ecclesiastical authorities. In this manner the Church controls the State, and if the rights of a dissenter should be violated the State would be impotent to correct or punish it.

"*Education.* All public education by the State has been placed under Church control, and some curious results may be noted. As the Church authorities are granted the right to insist that all teaching in institutions supported by the State shall conform to Catholic dogma and morals, no one is allowed to teach in the universities, colleges or schools who is not satisfactory to the Church; and more repressive yet is the regulation, enforced in some of the State colleges and said to be enforced in all, that students are absolutely required to go to the confessional as well as attend the services of the Church.

"If it be objected to, students may attend private institutions, and while there is nothing in the legislation that prevents the establishment of these private schools, their diplomas have no legal force whatever, and in addition to this inconvenience, the institution itself exists in constant danger of being closed by an administrative order from the Government authorities at any time.

"Law No. 61, of 1888, grants to the executive some extraordinary powers.

"'The President of the Republic is granted the power: 1. To prevent and repress administratively the offenses and crimes against the State that may affect public order, with power, according to the case, to impose the penalties of confinement, expulsion from the territory, imprisonment or loss of political rights to the time he may think necessary.

"'Art. 2. The President of the Republic shall exercise the right of inspection and vigilance over scientific associations and teaching institutions, and is authorized to suspend, for the time he may consider convenient, any society or establishment which under scientific or doctrinal pretext may be a centre of revolutionary propagandism or of subversive teaching.'

"*Liberty of the Press and Worship.* The Constitution, Art. 42, says: 'The Press is free in time of peace; but responsible in accord with the laws, when it may attack the honour of the individuals, social order or the public tranquillity.' In a decree of the Chief Executive of the nation, that has all the force of the law and that has been in force for several years, there is one article that makes it a criminal offense to 'attack the Catholic religion,' and one of the most prominent of the late public writers of Colombia supported the law in this way: 'We have been asked if the text and spirit of this Art. 42 authorizes the lawmaker to make a law that will consider as offenses obscene writings, and those that involve blasphemy, and evident attacks on the Catholic religion. We answer most decidedly, yes; such was the intention of the Constitutional Convention, and it is supported by two considerations; First, that as Art. 38 declares the Catholic religion to be the essential element of social order, therefore blasphemy and all attacks on Catholicism can be considered as contrary to social order; and second, because Art. 40 gives the force of a constitutional principle to Christian morals; and if whatever offends Christian morals can be made a crime or offense and punished, the same thing can be done if executed through the press, given that the said acts are contrary to social order.'

"The press laws are contained in an 'Administrative Decree' and are enforced without process of law, that is administratively rather than judicially. But the administrative officers of Colombia have never yet, so far as we know, interfered with the liberty of public or private worship."

It is evident from the historic conditions which have now been sufficiently outlined that South America under Spain and Rome was a closed field for evangelical missions. Even if the Protestant Church has been awake to missionary duty, she could not have gone to Spanish America, where no other religion than that of the Roman Catholic Church would then have been tolerated. Only after the Spanish Latin States had won their liberty both from Spain and Rome, could Protestant missionaries live in them. Those days, however, were anticipated in some interesting ways. In 1555, the first attempt at Protestant evangelization was made by the French Huguenots, Admiral Coligny sending out a small expedition to Brazil in the hope of finding a refuge there from persecution, of converting the Indians and of establishing a commonwealth in the New World. On an island in the Bay of Rio, "they erected the first place of worship and here the French Puritans offered their prayers and sang their hymns of praise nearly threescore years and ten before a pilgrim placed his foot on Plymouth Rock and more than half a century before the Book of Common Prayer was borne to the bank of the James River." Through the treachery of Villegagnon, their leader, these first missionary colonists of Protestantism in South America met only disaster and the enterprise ended in failure; some dying, some returning. A few escaped and began work among the Indians. Jean de Boileau or John

Boles, the most influential and successful, was seized by the Jesuits and in due time executed as a heretic.[1]

In the following century, the Dutch held for varying periods in 1624–1625, some of the Brazilian ports and the Dutch missionaries did something, both by preaching and by publishing books, to reach the people, but all traces of their work have passed away.[2] A century later, in 1738, the Moravian missions were begun under Dutch guidance and in 1805, Henry Martyn, on his way to India, touched at Bahia long enough to ascend the battery overlooking the Bay of All Saints and to pray for the evangelization of the peoples of the lands about him. "As he gazed upon the scene, he repeated the hymn:

"'O'er the gloomy hills of darkness
Look, my soul be still and gaze.'

Before resuming his voyage, he found opportunities to enter the monasteries, Vulgate in hand, and reason with the priests out of the Scriptures."

As early as 1823, after the independence of the Republics, missionaries were allowed to open schools in Buenos Ayres, and conduct preaching services and circulate Bibles. The work, however, was soon given up. For a time the circulation of the Bible was widely tolerated in the new States. In Bogota, a Bible Society was organized. The Secretary of State was its President and ecclesiastics were among its officers. In many places, the priests facilitated the circulation of the New Testament in Spanish and the Lancasterian schools using Scripture selections as reading lessons were established in Argentine, Montevideo, Chili, Peru and Colombia, Guatemala and Mexico. It seemed for a time that the evangelical movement would permeate the Catholic Church and thus make possible the evangelization of these lands without the introduction of Protestantism. Mr. Brown writes of this time:

> "Mr. James Thomson was an agent both of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and of a British and Foreign School Society. As the agent of the Lancasterian schools he met with a favourable reception from the civil authorities.

---

[1] Parkman, *The Pioneers of France in the New World*, Ch. II.

[2] *Brazilian Bulletin*, No. 1, p. 37.

"His letters, afterwards published, were written from South America in the years 1820 to 1825. In his efforts to establish schools, Mr. Thomson secured the coöperation of many prelates of the Roman Catholic Church. Some of these went so far as to speak favourably of his circulation of the Bible in Spanish and its translation into Indian languages. A general desire to educate the masses, and thus secure the fruits of liberty is often referred to in these letters.

"In 1820 Mr. Thomson gathered 100 boys in a Lancasterian school in Buenos Ayres, and taught them to read, using Scripture passages as the text. Several hundred copies of the New Testament were also circulated. One was obtained by a Patagonian chief who said he would explain it to his tribe. Schools were also established in Chili, with this endorsement from the Dictator O'Higgins: 'The object of this institution is to extend in every direction throughout Chili the benefits of education; to promote the instruction of all classes, but especially of the poor.' The few newspapers in circulation favoured the enterprise. In Lima a convent was turned over to be used as a school. 'The order for the friars to vacate was given on Saturday; on Monday they began to remove, and on Tuesday the keys were delivered up.' The Bible also was publicly sold at 'a short distance from the place where used to sit the dreadful Inquisition.' Some wondered 'in view of this zeal for the Bible how they had been taught that the English were not Christians.' Many, Mr. Thomson noticed, 'espoused deistical principles' when freed from 'the trammels of popery.'

"Not only in Lima did parents ask for copies of the Word, and priests encouraged its study. From Ecuador, a friend, engaged in the work of distribution wrote to Mr. Thomson: 'With pleasure have I seen in passing through the streets of Guayaquil, not once or twice, but mostly every day, the shop-keepers and the poor people, who have stalls, read in the blessed gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. If I had had ten times as many (New Testaments) I am persuaded I could have sold them all.'

"At one time Mr. Thomson sold New Testaments to five friars in Guayaquil, and one took thirteen copies. The governor of Guaranda bought a copy and told his friends to do the same. With the permission of its prior, 104 copies were sold from a stall in the convent of Latanga. In Quito, the Marquis of San Jose, although a Catholic, allowed the sale of Testaments in his own house. The bishop of Popayan was the only one who opposed the movement. Indeed, in Bogota, the capital of Colombia, a Bible Society was organized. The Secretary of State was its president; the vice-president was the Minister of Finance; the treasurer was a senator; while the second and third vice-presidents were ecclesiastical dignitaries, and one of the secretaries was a priest. *The Constitutional*, a leading journal, wrote: 'This Bible Society has been established with the consent and approval of the most distinguished persons actually intrusted with the executive Government of the Republic and the ecclesiastical Government of the Archbishopric to whom it belongs exclusively and without dispute to watch over the spiritual and temporal happiness of the people, and whose fidelity none, without injustice, can call in question.'

"Agencies of the Bible Society were also started in Buenos Ayres, Santiago, Valparaiso, Lima, Guayaquil and Quito; not to mention points of less importance. Thousands of copies of the New Testament were sold in Spanish, often with the help of Roman Catholic ecclesiastics, and a translation of the New Testament was made into Quichua, a native language spoken by more than a million Indians. No wonder the enthusiastic Bible agent felt that 'great and happy changes' were being affected of a kind impossible under Spanish rule, and that, 'what is going forward in these countries is truly a *revolution* in every sense of the word.'

"The establishment of Lancasterian schools in which Scripture selections were used as reading lessons, progressed finely. In Buenos Ayres there were soon one hundred schools with 5,000 pupils. In Montevideo a liberal minded Catholic clergyman headed the movement. O'Higgins favoured it in Chili. San Martin helped it forward in Peru. Bolivar changed the Ocopa college of Spanish friars into a school, and ordered the establishment of these schools in every provincial capital to supply trained teachers for the towns and hamlets. In 1826 two young Colombians were to be found in London studying the system.

"Mr. Lancaster directed the movement in Caracas, Venezuela, and gave $20,000 to insure its success. The movement spread in Guatemala and Mexico. In Mexico City a school of 300 children was opened in the halls of the Inquisition once so inimical to general enlightenment. The pupils were said to be 'acquiring a taste for the perusal of the Scriptures,' and learning 'to be virtuous, charitable, tolerant and free,' and Rocafuerte, a prominent patriot of that period, adds: 'This moral education will promote the cause of religious toleration and will effect the regeneration which our new political system requires.' Mr. Thomson's own comment is that 'the public voice is decidedly in favour of UNIVERSAL EDUCATION . . . this feeling prevails among the clergy and the laity, the governors and governed.'

"These letters, and similar statements made by other writers of that early day, make prominent two facts:

"First, that the general eagerness to secure copies of the Scriptures showed plainly that, as a class, the clergy, as well as the laity, were unacquainted with the Bible, although they probably had some knowledge of isolated passages, for example, of the parables and historical narratives, and of selections given in books of devotion, or in occasional religious discourses. What a comment on Romish instruction is the fact that monks, priests and even bishops, purchased Spanish Testaments, read them as a novelty, and were often pathetically eager to secure the complete Bible which they had never seen. Not merely the masses, but the religious teachers also were densely ignorant of God's Word. And the same is true to-day in almost equal degree. The signs of a promised revival within the Roman Catholic Church came to naught for some occult reason, connected doubtlessly with the system of which they were a part.

"The second fact which causes surprise, in the light of the modern attitude towards the Bible, is the ready purchase of the Spanish New Testament by monks and priests, and the help in its sale given by Roman Catholic laymen, the priors of convents and even the bishops, as well as by presidents, governors, and lesser political magistrates. Only one bishop is mentioned who saw that a position had been taken, in the enthusiasm of the moment, from which the papal authorities at Rome would force them to withdraw.

"We note the change, later on, when the colporteur is no longer lodged in a convent, but in the jail; and when instead of organizing Bible Societies the Romish authorities burn the Bible. In Columbia, for example, Thomson had, in 1825, a reception very different from that accorded Norwood in 1898. As soon as it was fully appreciated that study of the Bible weaned men from the papacy, the circulation of the Bible was forbidden, and efforts were made to suppress the whole evangelical movement."

The Catholic Church soon rejected the reform. The schools died. The circulation of the Bible was forbidden and the Church set herself against the movement of freedom and progress.[2]

The first enduring Protestant mission to South America began with the sacrifice of Capt. Allen Gardiner who perished of starvation in September 1851 in Spaniard Harbor, Terra del Fuego, in a cavern to which the searching party was directed by a hand painted on the rocks with Psalm 62 : 5–8 under it:

"My soul, wait thou only upon God;
For my expectation is from Him.
He only is my rock and my salvation.
He is my high tower; I shall not be moved.
With God is my salvation and my glory:
The rock of my strength and my refuge is in God.
Trust in Him at all times ye people;
Pour out your heart before Him;
God is a refuge for us."

Gardiner had been instrumental in establishing in 1844 the South American Missionary Society and his death gave its work a new impulse, as the heroism and devotion of his life have inspired workers at home and abroad in all churches and in all lands.[3] It was of the results of the work which Gardiner began that Charles Darwin spoke

---

[1] Brown, *Latin America*, pp. 185–190.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 190–193.

[3] Young, *From Cape Horn to Panama*, Ch. I; Marsh and Stirling, *The Story of Commander Allen Gardiner, R. N.*

in his often quoted testimony to the value of Christian missions: "The success of the Terra del Fuego Mission is most wonderful and charms me, as I always prophesied utter failure. It is a grand success. I shall feel proud if your committee think fit to elect me an honorary member of your Society."[1]

This work was however in purely heathen territory and among the aborigines. The first permanent work in the Latin States was begun by Dr. Kalley, an independent Scotch missionary, in Rio de Janeiro in 1855, followed shortly in Brazil in 1859 by the Rev. A. G. Simonton of the Presbyterian Church and by the Rev. H. B. Pratt of the same Church who settled in Bogota in 1856. The Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists and Episcopalians from America, with the Moravians and the South American Missionary Society, the latter a Church of England organization, have been the chief missionary agencies at work.

To the very existence of the work, vigorous objections have been made. It is said that it is an intrusion upon territory already occupied and fully covered by another branch of the Christian Church; that this other branch of the Church is a true Church, exerting a beneficial influence and much better adapted than the Protestant Churches to meeting the needs of romantic and emotional people like the Latin Americans, who are deeply devoted to their Church, and who can only be either perplexed or angered by Protestant invasion. These opinions are shared by many good people who know devout Christian Catholics in the United States, and not unnaturally assume that the Catholic Church is everywhere what they believe it to be here. A candid examination of these objections will justify the presence of the Protestant Missions in Latin America.

1. They have not intruded. "Every important movement of Protestantism in these countries has had its origin in the response to a call coming from these countries themselves and from the native people. Everywhere are to be found those who long for better things and who have sent out their cry into the Christian world until it has been heard and heeded."[2] In 1882, President Barrios of Guatemala urged the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions to send a missionary to Guatemala and offered to pay his expenses to the field. When

---

[1] Young, *The Success of Christian Missions*, pp. 254–259.

[2] *Protestant Missions in South America*, p. 113.

General Sarmiento was elected President of the Argentine "one of the first things he did was to give Dr. William Goodfellow, an American missionary returning to the United States, a commission to send out a number of educated women to establish normal schools in Argentina."[1] The testimony and invitation of President Roca have already been quoted. Such evidence might be multiplied—from the side of the people as well as from their rulers. Much of the work of the missions was original and spontaneous, the missionaries being invited by people, already broken from Rome, to come and give them further guidance and instruction. There is, of course, the most bitter opposition from the Church.[2] The *Defensa Catolica*, published in Mexico, declared plainly in 1887, "In the Lord's service and for love of Him, we must, if need be, offend men; we must if need be, wound and kill them. Such actions are virtuous and can be performed in the name of Catholic Charity."[3] And where the Government is under the control of the Church, there is vexatious political hindrance of missions.[4] Those who say that Latin America does not want Protestant missions have only this ground for their statement, namely, the Catholic Church does not want them. That they are not regarded by the people as an intrusion is shown by the fact that the constitutions of almost all the Republics have been amended, in spite of the opposition of the Church, to allow freedom of religion and to secure the rights of those who hold and propagate other forms of faith than the Roman.

---

[1] *Protestant Missions in South America*, p. 109.

[2] "I visited Tubarao, which is one of the most fanatical towns I have met with. I had very hard work to arrange a place to hold meetings as no one would rent me a room for such a dreadful purpose. One woman I went to see has a hall which she rents for dances, etc. When I went in she was adding up the winnings of the day's gambling as she is an inveterate gambler. But when I stated my errand she said quickly, 'No, I will rent no hall of mine for such an ungodly purpose!' Ungodly! The preaching of God's word! Poor people, they are so taught by their priests who cannot say bad things enough about us, calling us devils, emissaries of the devil, etc. Strange how in the United States these Romish priests are so eager to be called our 'brethren.' As soon as they get the power there they will show whose 'brethren' they consider us to be. Where Rome has the power she is still as intolerant of all civil and religious liberty as she was in the middle ages. As was said in a tract which was distributed here only a short time ago, 'We (the Romanists) are tolerant, the friends of progress and liberty, but we cannot be tolerant towards Protestantism any more than a nation can be towards cholera morbus or the plague.' Yes, Yes, Liberal and tolerant to all who believe blindly what they teach and to them alone" (From letter from the Rev. R. F. Lenington, Florianopolis, Brazil, July 23, 1903.)

[3] Brown, *Latin America*, p. 247.

[4] *Ecumenical Conference Report*, Vol. I, p. 477.

2. The territory is not already occupied and fully covered by the Catholic Church. There are, it is estimated, about 5,000,000 Indians in South America, 3,000,000 of them Quichua-speaking. For many of them, the Catholic Church is doing nothing at all. And for many of the other peoples, it does next to nothing. If it furnishes them with occasional worship and confessional, it yet leaves them utterly ignorant, providing no adequate schools, nor literature, nor vital inspiration. Even where it displays itself most, the work of enlightenment and purification, without which nations cannot live, is not done. Protestant schools are crowded everywhere and might be multiplied indefinitely, and be in large measure or entirely self-supporting. If the Roman Church were doing what needs to be done, there would be no such educational demand as to-day appeals to every Protestant mission.

3. The Roman Catholic Church is not in South America what it is with us and its influence has never been and is not now in Latin America a salutary and uplifting influence. By the limitations upon marriage through exorbitant fees, the Church has promoted illegitimacy. As Mr. Curtis wrote of Ecuador, "The ceremony of marriage is not observed to any great extent for the expense of matrimony is too heavy for the common people to think of paying it. For this, the Catholic Church is responsible and to it can be traced the cause of the illegitimacy of more than half of the population."[1] The priests, themselves, often fail to illustrate purity in their own lives.[2] It is a Church, as Dr. Blackford sternly wrote of what he had seen of its influence in Brazil, which has "deprived the Gospel of its transforming and sanctifying power, it has interfered with liberty of conscience, it has trampled under foot the rights of men, it has subsidized everything it could grasp for its own aggrandizement, and has seized upon the control of education and the reins of political influence. As a religion, it has ignored the simplicity of the Gospel, corrupted and degraded many of the doctrines of the Cross and adapted itself to the human heart by pandering to its pride and self-seeking by means of

---

[1] *Capitals of South America*, p. 306.

[2] See article "The Struggle for Liberty in South America," *Missionary Review of the World*, May, 1902, p. 359.

penance and meritorious deeds. As a Church, it is bitter, relentless and persecuting towards others, and in itself it is the monopoly of pride and arrogance, worldliness and error, idolatry and superstition." Is such a Church to be left in possession of the religious, moral and social interests, yes, and of the intellectual and political interests also, inseparably associated with these, of 40,000,000 of our fellow creatures? The people who have no religion may answer this question affirmatively, but no one will do so who knows the human heart or human history. The President of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, the Rev. George Alexander, D. D., upon returning from a visit to Brazil in the summer of 1903, said in his report to the Board:

> "With every disposition to think as favourably as possible of the Roman Catholic Church, I am persuaded that the missionaries do not exaggerate the baleful influence of that type of religion which Rome has given Latin America. Her doctrine and discipline have sapped the foundation of virile character, fettered intellect and conscience and utterly failed to check immorality and vice. She may even be called the patron of vice. She shares with the State, the responsibility for a lottery system pervasive, obtrusive and hideously demoralizing. The festals of the Church are in many cases wild orgies, and the clergy themselves are so generally depraved that they lead the weak of their flocks in the ways of sin and provoke the more intelligent and moral to disbelieve in the divine origin of Christianity and even in the existence of God. This is no libel upon the priesthood, but a statement abundantly confirmed by Catholic authorities.
>
> "The priesthood of Brazil is only to a very limited extent Brazilian. It is recruited almost exclusively from abroad and from the least desirable elements. At the present time, there is a great influx of monks and friars who are taking possession of old ecclesiastical properties and in some cases spiriting the accumulated treasures of the monasteries off to Rome. In such centres as Sao Paulo there is a marked revival of church activity indicated by the establishment of schools and the erection of new buildings. Most of these recent importations are friars from the Philippines or members of orders banished from France: an infusion which does not tend to raise the moral tone of the clergy, though some of them are men of great capacity. The Archbishop of Rio, for example, is acknowledged to be a man of tremendous force whose influence upon the Federal administration is almost unbounded. At the same time, it is true that the immigration of ecclesiastics has touched the sensibilities of the people who are morbidly apprehensive of foreign influence. Bills are now pending in Congress, framed somewhat on the French model, which if enacted will not only check monastic immigration and take education out of the hands of the priesthood, but will also abridge, somewhat, the privileges which our own missionaries have hitherto enjoyed.

"The usual fruits of such a debased form of Christianity are painfully manifest. The intelligence of Brazil is in revolt against the Church. Educated men for the most part adopt the philosophy of positivism, and those whose spiritual cravings will not be satisfied with such a creed eagerly accepted the teachings of spiritualism. The spiritualists are very active in disseminating their literature and seriously hinder the progress of evangelical truth.

"The most influential man in South America in an interview which I had with him on the day of my sailing from Rio, said, 'It is sad, sad to see my people so miserable when they might be so happy. Their ills, physical and moral, spring from a common source, lack of religion. They call themselves Catholics, but the heathen are scarcely less Christian. The progress of the Anglo-Saxon race is due to their religion. Our people have left the firm foundation and are trying to build their fabric in the air. Two weeks ago, I had a call in this office from Julio Maria, a Catholic priest of great learning and eloquence, who has been traversing Brazil from north to south, preaching and holding conferences. He said to me, "The moral and religious condition of this people is unspeakable, almost remediless. I see but a single ray of hope and as a Catholic priest I am ashamed to say where I see it." I expect him to tell me, that he finds it in some Protestant mission.'"

4. Even if the Roman Catholic Church in South America were better than it is, Protestant Missions engaged in founding Protestant Churches would be needed to do for the Catholic Church just what the Protestant Church does for it in the United States. Without the check of powerful evangelicalism round about it, the Catholic Church tends to become everywhere just what Dr. Blackford has described. With a strong Protestant environment, it is purged of grosser superstition and saved from the base consequences of its own self-development. Already in Mexico, the influence of Protestantism begins to be felt in counter reforming movements in the Catholic Church and that will be the course of affairs all over Latin America. The Protestant Churches will not absorb the Catholic Church. They will in a measure purify it.

5. The Protestant movement is not a mere proselytism. It is not that at all. It is a powerful educational and moral propaganda, teaching freedom and purity. It is also a powerful evangelistic agency, aiming at the conversion to Christianity of people, who, whatever their ecclesiastical relations, are often only adherents of a refined heathenism. The purposes of the missions are not destructive or polemic. They aim at the spiritualization of the dead religion

which has cumbered these nations and would keep them from light and progress. They would be happy if this could be accomplished by general reformation within the Church, but failing that, they must strive to accomplish it by winning men one by one to a true and reasonable and enlightening faith.

6. The Latin American States need the type of character which only a strong evangelical religion can produce. "Owing to the lamentable want of public morality south of the equator, and to the cynicism of the political vultures who make it their business to prey upon their fatherland," says Mr. Child, "it is always a painful task to speak about the administration of the South American Republics."[1] Four centuries of Roman and Latin influence have not been a good education in integrity and these States are doomed unless an element of moral purpose and trustworthiness can be created in them, which nothing but a pure religion can provide.

The responsibility for meeting this need of Latin America rests upon us, the nearest neighbour. We have assumed towards the American Republics an attitude of political responsibility which, however acceptable it was to them once, has become a little irritating to them now. It is not unlikely that that responsibility will have to be discharged in yet more active ways. If we protect Latin America against the world we must protect the world against Latin America in some more adequate sense. We cannot endure the worse than Asiatic corruption and disorder of some of these States. But they do not enjoy the prospect of such coercion. Their racial sympathies also are stronger than their political. They felt for Spain rather than the United States in the war over Cuba. They are afraid now of growing American predominance and are fearful lest American designs should work to their humiliation and dependence. The only safe and certain way to disarm such fears and to win their confidence and to clean up their corruption is to establish a closer relationship in religious convictions and moral principles. There is no adequate reformatory agency save Christianity, and there is no cement of personal or national intercourse comparable with common religious sentiments and beliefs and hopes. We owe it not less to the common destiny of this Western Hemisphere that we should share with these people our Christian inheritance to which they are strangers, than we owe it to them as nations and as men.[1]

---

[1] Child, *South American Republics*, p. 435; see Carpenter, *South America*, p. 368.

---

[1] ". . . During several years spent in these countries, I have carefully studied the subject, and enjoyed the opportunity of discussing it with the leading statesmen of Jamaica, Trinidad, Hayti, Colombia, Venezuela and other countries. They are all convinced that the present state of affairs cannot continue and that some great change is looming in the near future.

"'With the development of foreign commerce in these regions,' said one of the leading British officials in Trinidad to me recently, 'the exploitation of Latin America by political adventurers must inevitably cease. The question is whether America will undertake the task of establishing law and order, or whether by pursuing her present policy, she will drive the European powers to combine once for all, to shatter the Monroe doctrine and colonize South America.'

"General Fouchard, the only wise and responsible statesman in Hayti, spoke to me not long ago in similar terms. 'Unless we begin to live properly,' he confessed, 'we must soon lose our national independence. Day by day the Government of Hayti receives warnings that the patience of the Powers is almost exhausted, and so do the Governments of other Latin American Republics which act like Hayti.'

"From a study of the question on the spot, one is forced to the conclusion that the only way permanently to safeguard the Monroe Doctrine is for America to come boldly forward and guarantee to Europe the preservation of law and order throughout Latin America. This sounds like a large proposition, but the question is a vast one anyway and arrangements might be made to mitigate the responsibility of America. For example, it should be possible to secure the cooperation of the Latin-American Powers which have manifested a desire for orderly civilization and commercial expansion. I refer particularly to Mexico, Chili and Argentina. Could they not be induced to assist America in keeping their ill-behaved sisters in order? If so, their assistance would be invaluable by reason of their strategic position in relation to the States to be disciplined.

"There is another aspect of the question which should commend itself more strongly to the American people. There is no people in the world more ready to take up the cause of oppressed communities 'ez fur away ez Paris is.' Their tears have flowed and their hearts have grown hot within them over the misfortunes of the Armenians, the Roumanian Jews and the victims of Kishineff. Do they ever stop to reflect that in Colombia, Venezuela, Hayti and other similar countries infinitely worse atrocities happen daily and the common people are reduced by a bandit soldiery to a condition of misery probably unequalled anywhere else in the world?

"The recent civil wars in Colombia and Hayti, like the revolution now ending in Venezuela, have been marked from start to finish by sickening atrocities. Those who live in these countries are unwilling witnesses of scenes which they dare not describe to a civilized and humane public. Details would be given, but they are too revolting to be related in print. Yet they happen daily in the worst governed Republic of the Latin-American Republics. Surely America will admit some responsibility in the matter. She cannot decently wash her hands like Pilate, saying she is innocent of the blood and misery at her doors, and then rebuke Russia and Roumania for ill-treating the Jews" (*New York Sun*, October 6, 1903. Letter from William Thorp).

The Development of Africa

V

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AFRICA

OUR world was a long time in coming to a knowledge of its bounds. North and South America were late enough in slipping into the thought of the older world; but the Eastern Hemisphere knew scarcely more about itself. On the globe which Martin Behaim produced in 1492, he says quaintly: "It should be understood that in this present figure of the globe the whole world is measured out in length and breadth according to the science of geometry, as Ptolemy has written for us in his book called 'The Cosmology of Ptolemy.' The remaining part is according to what the Knight Marco Polo of Venice, who travelled in the East in 1250 has left written out. The worthy Doctor and Knight John de Mandeville, in the year 1522, also produced a book bringing to light the unknown land of Ptolemy in the East, together with the islands in that region whence are brought to us spices, pearls and precious stones. But the illustrious King Don John of Portugal, in the year 1485, caused his ships to explore the remainder of the earth which was unknown to Ptolemy, in which discovery I, the maker of this globe, took a part. Towards the West is the Ocean Sea more than appears in Ptolemy's writings, and the Pillars of Hercules even to Islands of Azores, Fayal and Pico, which islands were settled by the noble and most excellent Knight Jobst de Wõrter of Markirchen, my respected father-in-law, with his people that he led from Flanders. And he possessed and ruled these and the far spreading regions of the world towards the north and the north pole. Beyond what the writings of Ptolemy contain, Iceland, Norway and Russia are now known to us, and every year voyages are made there. No one can well doubt the world is entire, or that it can all be sailed around with ships, or that one can go wherever he chooses."[1]

Martin Behaim's globe contains, of course, only Europe, Asia and Africa. The outline of Europe is measurably correct, although

---

[1] See map in Keltie, *Partition of Africa*, facing p. 40.

Italy and Greece appear to be islands. Eastern Asia is entirely wanting, and the Indian peninsula is treated in the same way as Italy and Greece. The remarkable feature of the globe is the accuracy of outline of the continent of Africa, its chief error being a protuberance of Southern Africa to the east in a way that carried the mainland beyond the actual site of Madagascar. As the years passed by such errors were corrected, and "Smith's New Map of Africa" published in 1815, revealed an exact knowledge of the coast outline and filled it with correct tribal names. The interior, however, was still an enigma, more so even than it had been, because the imaginations of men were less fervent and unbridled, and what they did not know they did not imagine that they knew. On Smith's map, the Nile ended in the Mountains of the Moon. The Congo was known for a short distance from its mouth, and was called the Zaire. Neither the mouth nor the source of the Niger was known, although an interior section of the river was put down on the map, which knew nothing, of course, of the great inland lakes, although it marked in part the supposed outlines of one, Lake Maravi or Zimba, corresponding roughly in shape, size and situation to Lake Tanganyika, and lying under the "Mountains of Lupata, or Spine of the World, covered with snow." That was what was known of Africa in 1815.

It would require a volume instead of a paragraph to outline the exploration of the African interior. Dr. Supan divides the great work that has been done into two epochs, one prior and the other subsequent to 1850. The former was the period of individual exploration in the north and south dealing with the Niger problem, the Nile territories and South Africa. The latter was the period of co-operation, when the explorations in Northern and Southern, Eastern and Western Africa were connected with one another. Three great river problems were settled, the Nile, the Zambesi, and the Congo; the Sahara Desert and the Sudan were explored, a thousand details were filled in, and the problems of the slave trade, colonization and the liquor traffic became international problems. A score of memorable names stand out in the history of African exploration, but our limits and purposes allow room here for the mention of but one, the greatest and most influential of all, David Livingstone.

Livingstone went to Africa in connection with the London Missionary Society in 1841, having sailed from England on December 8, 1840. Before he had been three years among the Bechuanas, he became convinced that the field was too small for the force the society was providing. Finding that a brother missionary was willing to go with him to a new station among the Bakhatlas, they went and established themselves there "on their own responsibility, and in the hope that the directors would approve of it. But if they did not, he told them that he was at their disposal 'to go anywhere *provided it be forward.*'"[1] This call of God into a country he knew not pressed so upon Livingstone, that after a number of journeys, among them one clear across the continent, the first ever made by a European, from which he returned across the continent to the east coast again, he severed his connection with the London Missionary Society, and gave himself to the work of opening Africa, with the double purpose of thus making a way for the introduction of Christianity and of destroying the slave trade. Into this work Livingstone threw himself with all his energy and consecration, and concerned himself in all his journeys and discoveries, whether tracing the course of the Zambesi or the Luapula or looking upon the great inland seas, gazing at their waters with the first white man's eyes that ever looked upon them, or tracing their boundaries, as an agent of God, doing a divinely appointed and truly religious work. And the results have vindicated his conviction. Livingstone's life and work and death gave the most powerful impulse to European interest in Africa, to the movement for the suppression of the slave trade, and to the resolution to unfold all the mysteries of interior Africa that they have ever received. And Stanley's work, which next to Livingstone's is responsible for the greatest changes in Africa, was the direct result of the Scotch missionary's. Stanley himself said of him, "In the annals of exploration of the dark continent we look in vain among other nationalities for such a name as Livingstone's."[2] He had "travelled 29,000 miles in Africa, and added 1,000,000 square miles to the known regions of the globe."[3] "It will be long," said Sir Bartle Frere, as President of the Royal Geographical Society, "ere any one man will be able to open so large an extent of unknown land to civilized mankind. . . . Every year will add fresh evidence to show how well considered were the plans he took in hand, and how vast have been the results of the movements he set in motion."[1] Nor has Livingstone's life been the only missionary agency which directly or by means of its work has opened Africa and traced its rivers and described its people. The missionary energy used in doing this has surely been spent legitimately. Some people misunderstood Livingstone, and criticized him for having abandoned his proper work; but he believed that opening fresh fields was the beginning of his proper work. As he said, "The end of the geographical feat is but the beginning of the missionary enterprise." And the spirit in which missionaries in every part of Africa have done the absolutely necessary work of exploration and language study has been the spirit of Krapf, who wrote of one of his exploratory journeys, "My spirit often urged me to go behind a large tree at a little distance from the village, where I could see into the valleys, as well as the distant Wakuafi wilderness, and look upon the little mountains around me, to weep and pray that the Redeemer's kingdom might soon be established in these heights, and that His songs might be heard on these lofty hills; and in full reliance on the promises of God, I took possession of the pagan land for the militant Church of Christ."[2]

---

[1] Blaikie, *Personal Life of David Livingstone*, p. 61.

[2] *The Congo*, Vol. II, p. 385.

[3] Noble, *The Redemption of Africa*, Vol. II, p. 696.

The geographical exploration of Africa has been accompanied from the beginning by the establishment of Christian missions. The Portuguese navigators in the early days took with them their priests and missionaries, and in 1665 the first Dutch missionary, representing the Protestant Churches, landed at the Cape.[3] The first native Church in South Africa was built in 1800. The Dutch, English and Scotch missions in South Africa have until the last few years been the markedly successful missions in Africa, and South Africa below the Zambesi and the seventeenth parallel of latitude, is called Christian. Along the East and West coasts, among the pagan or Mohammedan tribes, practically all the Churches of Christendom have missionary representatives, and in the north, though the field is almost adamantine in its inhospitability to the Gospel, the Mohammedan states along the Mediterranean have not been wholly neglected, while a flourishing mission exists in Egypt, where a foundation is provided in the old Coptic Church. Since the opening of the Congo, a belt of stations has been thrown across Africa in the line of the great journey of Stanley, who found here in 1877 not one Christian, or Christian missionary. The Sudan, of which I shall speak later, is the sole remaining section of interior Africa of great magnitude still awaiting any extensive and aggressive attempt at evangelization.

---

[1] Blaikie, *Personal Life of David Livingstone*, pp. 455, 457.

[2] Stock, *History of the Church Missionary Society*, Vol. II, p. 128.

[3] White, *The Development of Africa*, p. 142.

The character and results of the best missionary work in Africa are shown in the Scotch Presbyterian missions in what were formerly called Kaffraria and Nyassa land, but are now parts of Cape Colony and British Central Africa, and in the Church of England Mission in Uganda in British East Africa. The three great centres of the Scotch Presbyterians are at Lovedale, Blythswood and Livingstonia. And the names of Dr. Stewart and Dr. Laws will be associated always with the two great institutions at Lovedale in the Colony and Livingstonia at the southern end of Lake Nyassa. The policy pursued by the Scotch in this work is in principle the plan which Mackay of Uganda urged as the only wise policy for Africa. This was his scheme:

> "That the African is capable of Christianization, and of rising to take his place among the foremost races of men, I regard as an indisputable fact. Let it be remembered what Europe was at the beginning of our era. There we find fetishism, polygamy, slavery, absolute savagery, in many instances worse than anything to be found in Africa to-day. Christianity was introduced in no feeble and halting spirit, and notwithstanding the many corruptions of the Church of those days, the change wrought was more than marvellous. It is from the naked savages of Albion and Germania that have sprung such names as Newton and Shakespeare, Handel and Goethe. A present meeting of committee of a missionary society, deliberating about the extension of work abroad, is but the Christian development of those palavers which once were held by skin-clad Britons on the grassy bank of the Thames, where, with battle-axe in hand, they debated plans for a raid on a neighbouring tribe. The problems to be solved, and the conditions of the case, were pretty much the same in Europe once as they are now in Africa.
>
> "An engineer, in undertaking to throw a bridge across a river or ravine, finds himself limited on every hand in arranging his design. Three things may especially be noted as limiting the design.
>
> "(1) The nature of the foundation.

"(2) The materials at his disposal.

"(3) The conditions under which the workmen will have to build.

"If the foundation is good, he may build his bridge on piers, but here he is limited by the depth he must go, for workmen cannot safely live in water beyond a certain depth, nor can piers be carried up to a height beyond the strength of the foundation to bear the superstructure. If he fixes upon the suspension principle, he is again limited as to length of span, for the best material extant will only bear a certain weight, while the conditions under which the erecters will have to work may be impossible. In other words, the engineer must so arrange his design that in no part of the structure must any member be strained beyond what it can safely bear; nor must the design be such, however theoretically beautiful, as to be impossible of execution.

"Now, in endeavouring to span the continent of Africa, we must keep these conditions constantly in mind. In the case of bridge-piers, the main conditions are that they stand on a good foundation, are strong enough for the portion of weight to be borne by each, and that all rise to the same level. The pier principle is that hitherto adopted in Africa in mission work. Lines of stations have been planted, but too frequently in unhealthy centres, and these, like piers on a bad foundation, have frequently collapsed, or have been unduly loaded for their strength, hence gaps are constantly occurring. The plan has proved a conspicuous failure.

"Others have tried the suspension principle, but with no better success. A tower of strength has been built at each side of the mighty chasm—one at Freetown, the other at Frere Town—and strong links have been hung out from either side, in the hope of uniting in the centre. But the span has proved too great for the structure. Some of the strongest links have now and then given way, and the whole erection has again and again been in danger of falling. Every one knows that in suspension bridges we have not merely the two gigantic chains joining pier with pier, from which the whole platform is suspended, but the landward ends of the chains must be firmly tied back to the solid rock, otherwise the piers will give way, and the whole bridge will fall into the abyss. So, too, our landward or homeward ends have been now and then rendered shaky from want of being properly weighted down by home support. The design has proved a failure, even in the very trifling length, so far completed; more and more of a failure will it prove as the platform is lengthened, and a still heavier strain comes upon the piers. The progress of erection has also been hindered from want of confidence in the design on the part of the promoters, in addition to chronic and sudden hurricanes which have swept past and destroyed large portions which took years in erection.

"Is the problem, therefore, to be given up as insoluble? I think not. Have we begun to build, and are we unable to finish? Possibly we did not with sufficient care count the cost at first, and now we are inclined to despair. In our teeth is thrown a challenge by an educated African. Is his solution the only one, or will it prove a solution at all? He asserts that the cure for Africa is the

American negro in Africa. Methinks the experiment in Liberia has not hitherto proved such a decided success as to lead us to have confidence in it when tried on a larger scale. Like the old Israelites of the Exodus, their souls have not emerged from bondage, although their bodies are free. We must wait for all that generation, from twenty years old and upwards at the time of the Abolition, to die off first. There may be more pluck and less of the slavish spirit in the new generation. Even then I am doubtful of the result. There seems to be little or no enthusiasm for African regeneration, on the part of the mass of coloured people, either in the States or in the West Indies, or even in Liberia itself. Judging, too, from what I have seen of Africans when removed from their native locality, to one not very different in either food or climate, I have too much reason to believe that the American negro will be less at home in Africa than even the European.

"Rejecting, therefore, Dr. Blyden's solution, as a scheme of good hope, but of slender chance of success, let us look around for other agents who might thrive in Africa, and convert it to Christianity.

"Were the Arabs Christians, we could have good hopes of their success, from their indomitable pluck and perseverance. But, alas! Arabia has been neglected by the Church of Christ; and to-day, where we might look for invaluable missionaries of the Gospel, we find only fanaticism for a false faith. Hindus would probably find the climate of Africa not dissimilar to their own; but the teeming millions of heathen in India cannot afford to part with their feeble band of native evangelists.

"Africa *for* the African, and its regeneration *by* the African,' is a familiar watchword, and one that merits attention and examination. But how is the African to impart instruction to his fellows until he first receives instruction himself? There can be no evolution without corresponding and previous involution. You can get nothing out of the African without first putting it into him. Every effect must have a cause, nor will water rise higher than its source. Merely to teach the African reading and writing, and the elements of religious and secular knowledge, will be to leave him as before—a hewer of wood and a drawer of water. To quote the words of one of our ablest African missionaries (Johnson of Lagos): 'We must provide the negro with the highest education we can, only on the basis of African peculiarities.' Who is to do this? For many years to come, probably for a century at least, this must be the work of the Anglo-Saxon. But how and where is this to be done? In Africa itself? Do not Europeans die off there in almost every part of its tropical zone? Are not our funds also low, and existing stations already too insufficiently manned, to be able to undertake the work of carefully training a few, in addition to our ordinary work of the elementary teaching of many? The problem is difficult, and under the present *régime* insoluble. Perhaps, however, we may look once more to engineering for a solution.

"To span the Firth of Forth with a railway bridge has long defied the utmost skill of engineers. The water is too deep to render piers possible, while that span is too great to render the suspension principle at all feasible. Did they therefore entirely abandon the scheme as impracticable? No. They adopted a natural principle, perfect in conception and comparatively easy of execution; although the work is on so gigantic a scale that to compare it with the largest existing bridge is like comparing a grenadier guardsman with a new-born infant. The principle is called the CANTILEVER, which even the most unmechanical mind can understand at a glance. At each side of the Firth a high tower is built. Each of these towers is like the upright stem of a balance, or the stem of a tree, for from each side of the tower an arm or branch is built outwards, one to the right and one to the left. For every foot in length that is added to the seaward arm a similar foot length must be added to the landward arm, so as to make the balance even. The seaward arms on each side are, however, not continued until they meet, but stop short when their extremities are several hundred feet from each other. To fill this gap an ordinary girder is placed, having its ends resting on the seaward ends of the two cantilevers. In this marvellously simple way the mighty chasm (one-third of a mile) is spanned, which could not be done on any other known principle.

"Let us adopt this principle, by analogy, as our solution of the African problem. Instead of vainly struggling to perpetuate the method of feebly manned stations, each holding only precarious existence, and never able at best to exert more than a local influence, let us select a few particularly healthy sites, on each of which we shall raise an institution for imparting a thorough education, even to only a few. But instead of drawing from the general fund for the support of such institutions, let each be planted on a base of a fund of its own; and for every man added to the staff abroad, let there be secured among our friends at home a guarantee of sufficient amount to support him. This is the land arm of the cantilever: the man in the field is the seaward arm. Each institution must be a model or normal school, no one being admitted on the staff who has not been trained to teach. The pupils to receive, not an elementary, but as high an education as is in the power of their teachers to impart, only with the proviso that every pupil is to become a teacher himself. These institutions to be placed sufficiently far apart, so as not to interfere with each other, while for Eastern Africa only one language, viz., Suahili, to be adopted in all. From these centres, each with a large staff of teachers, the students will go forth to labour among their countrymen, thus filling up the gap between the long arms of the cantilever. Lovedale and Blythswood, in South Africa, I would mention as types already successful in no ordinary degree.

"We cannot put new wine into old bottles. We must educate, and that thoroughly, those who will, in time, take our place in the Christianizing of their own continent. To teach these African children to exercise their reason and their conscience, to think, to judge, is a work which must be done. It is not every one who will be able to take part in such a work. Everything like ideas of race superiority must be absent from the teacher's mind. He must be a master of method, and, first of all, able to impart the knowledge he possesses. Everything like gowns and caps and other paraphernalia of white men's colleges must be rigidly excluded. While provision is made for imparting a thoroughly good education, that must be pervaded in every part by a Christian spirit, and based on the Bible, which will be the leading text-book, and which all must learn without exception.

"In this way, probably soon, but under our present system, NEVER, will the prophecy of Victor Hugo be fulfilled, that 'the next century will make a MAN of the African.'"[1]

The policy pursued at Lovedale, Blythswood aud Livingstonia includes the earnest attempt to refrain in educating the African from lifting him so far above his people that he loses influence with them.[2] Where, as a negro delegate to the Ecumenical Conference said, people "are clothed with sunshine and fed by gravitation," a little unwise education can do a deal of harm, and missionaries need to anchor themselves securely to the face of the earth, and to teach their people what is possible of speedy incorporation into their own lives. The danger of mission work among the negroes has always been that the negro's "one notion of moral and social elevation would be, as to a very large extent it naturally is, to become, as far as possible in this world and even in the next, as much like the white man as possible. This directs his efforts to an ideal impossible to attain, diverting him from that which ought to be his object, namely, a development on the lines of the physical and moral constitution of his own race."[3] Instead of giving to their pupils a fictitious and superficial culture, disqualifying them for returning to their people and leading them upwards along the lines of their natural capacities, and under the physical conditions which actually surround them, the Scotch missionaries have made of them practical, sensible, industrious workers, whether in the ministry, or in agriculture or some trade, and have thus profoundly impressed the life of the country. "My heart is filled with gratitude," wrote Governor Grey of the Cape Colony, "to the missionaries who worked out so great and noble a success. I earnestly hope that heaven may still prosper the labours of such true friends of mankind. The success that has crowned your labours will secure great advantages to the Christian cause in this part of the world."

---

[1] *Mackay of Uganda*, pp. 455–463.

[2] Stewart, *Dawn in the Dark Continent*, Ch. VII.

[3] *C. M. S. Intelligencer*, February, 1888, p. 68.

This success has not been greater than that which has attended the work of the Church of England missionaries at Uganda. In 1875 Mr. Stanley had written a remarkable letter from Uganda to the *Daily Telegraph*, describing King Mtesa, and telling of his professed acceptance of Islam and of Stanley's presentation to him of Christianity as a better religion than Mohammedanism, and Mr. Stanley closed his letter by challenging Christendom to send missionaries into this wonderful field. The Church Missionary Society accepted the challenge, and in June, 1877, the missionaries reached Mtesa's capital, and found the King delighted to see them, and open in his protestations of faith in Christ. The letters they brought from the Society and the Sultan of Zanzibar were read by a boy whom Stanley had left with the King at his request, to teach him to read the Bible. "At the first pause," wrote one of the two missionaries who were the only ones of the party of eight who had reached Uganda, "the King ordered a feu de joie to be fired and a general rejoicing for the letter; but at the end, where it was said that it was the religion of Jesus Christ which was the foundation of England's greatness and happiness, and would be of his kingdom also, he half rose from his seat, called his head musician, Tolé, to him, and ordered a more vigorous rejoicing to be made, and desired the interpreter to tell us that this which we heard and saw (for all the assembly were bowing their heads gently and noiselessly clapping their hands and saying 'Nyanzig' five or six times) was for the name of Jesus. This from the centre of Africa, dim as his knowledge may be, must rejoice the hearts of all Christians. The King then asked, 'Have you seen my flag? I hoist that flag because I believe in Jesus Christ.' This Christian flag is a medley of all colours, suggestive of the universality of Christ's Kingdom."[1] In less than a year these first two missionaries were murdered, but others were already at hand, and in November, 1878, Mackay, who was one of the original appointees, reached the field, and began his great work. The French priests openly attacked the missionaries. In later years war and massacre, Romanism and Islam combined to crush the mission. But what God establishes men do not overthrow, and very soon the mission began to reap harvests which almost appalled the faith of the Church. By the end of 1894, 20,000 people were gathering in the churches on Sundays, and there were 2,500 baptized Christians and 1,100 catechumens. To-day there are 2,199 Christian lay teachers, 11,145 communicants, and 38,844 native Christians. And many districts are as fully evangelized as any sections of our own land. Native Christians as well as missionaries have given in martyrdom the living seed of this harvest. Uganda is but one of many illustrations of the irreparable loss the Church would have sustained if she had not had some who believed that life was to be yielded up often, but the privilege of Christian service and the duty of Christian confession never. Two months before the tidings of the death of the first two missionaries came, the venerable Krapf had written to the Society, "Though many missionaries may fall in the fight, yet the survivors will pass over the slain in the trenches, and take this great African fortress for the Lord." Mackay had said as much in the farewell meeting before leaving England. "I want to remind the committee," he said, "that within six months they will probably hear that one of us is dead." In the silence that followed, he went on, "Yes, is it at all likely that eight Englishmen should start for Central Africa and all be alive six months after? One of us at least—it may be I—will surely fall before that. But when that news comes, do not be cast down, but send some one else immediately to take the vacant place."[1] There is no challenge to the Church like the challenge of a missionary grave. When he laid his wife in the lonely grave at Mombasa in 1848, and a day or two after laid beside her his motherless little girl, Krapf wrote in a private letter, "My heart and body wept for many days;" but he wrote to the committee of the Society, "Tell our friends at home that there is now on the East African coast a lonely missionary grave. This is a sign that you have commenced the struggle with this part of the world; and as the victories of the Church are gained by stepping over the graves of her members, you may be the more convinced that the hour is at hand when you are summoned to the conversion of Africa from its eastern shore."[2]

---

[1] Stock, *History of the Church Missionary Society*, Vol III, p. 101.

The work of missions in Africa has had other consequences than the opening of the country by exploration, as by the work of Livingstone, and the civilization of the people, as in the case of

---

[1] Stock, *History of the Church Missionary Society*, Vol. III, p. 98.

[2] *Ibid*, Vol. I, pp. 461f.

Lovedale. It has in some cases been a determining factor in shaping the direction of destiny for large sections of country. There have been comparatively few instances of the appropriation of land and the assumption of sovereignty in reparation for the lives of missionaries, as in Shan-tung. There was no need of such pretexts, Africa wanting the type of highly organized, exclusive Government needing to be dealt with in China. Moreover, missions in Africa have been a protecting power in the case of native Governments, and where they have entered into the partition of Africa, it has been as an active force in shaping the direction of a development usually already determined upon on other grounds, and not as a passive pretext used in a selfish and commercial way by some power having ends to gain quite distinct from the missionary enterprise.

The movement for the partition of Africa among the European powers has been so conspicuous and unconcealed for the last fifteen years that we are often tempted to think that it has been going on for a long time. As a matter of fact, it is almost entirely a movement of the last half generation. At the beginning of the century, Portugal claimed to be chief owner of the continent. "Turkey was the only power which had a footing in North Africa; she was nominally the suzerain of Egypt, Tunis and Tripoli; but her power was even then on the wane. Algeria, with her corsairs was still the terror of the Mediterranean traders; Morocco was then as she is now, independent but tottering. To the Saharan 'Hinterland' of these Mediterranean states no power laid claim. The Central Sudan was powerful and independent, occupied by semi-civilized Mohammedan fanatics. Indeed, the whole of the Niger region was divided up into small states among which Mohammedanism was rapidly spreading. . . . France was left in possession of the west coast from Cape Blanco to the mouth of the Gambia, but except for a short distance along the Senegal, her power extended but a little way inland. Portugal had then, as she has now, the Cape Verde Islands, and a patch on the coast to the south of the Casamanza. England retained her old station on the Gambia; her Sierra Leone possession was but a patch; her stations on the Gold Coast were suffering from the abolition of the slave trade in 1807, while the colony of Lagos was not founded till long after. Denmark and Holland and Portugal had still several forts along the coast, though the Brandenburg settlement had long ago been abandoned. Liberia was not founded. The course of the Niger was unknown; trading stations or factories, were dotted here and there on the Oil Rivers, the Cameroons, and the Congo estuary, while the whole coast was the haunt of slavers of every nationality. Spain had Fernando Po, and Portugal one of the smaller islands to the south, but the whole coast down to the Congo was virtually no-man's land. . . . At the mouth of the Congo there were a few stations . . . mainly for slave trading purposes, though the slave trade was declared illegal in 1807 and was made piracy in 1817." From the Congo southward, Portugal claimed great stretches of territory, but nothing whatever was done with them. The Cape Colony, only finally made over to England in 1815, was but 120,000 square miles in area, and the regions beyond, where later grew up the Orange Free State, the Transvaal and Natal, were unknown. From the few Portuguese claims at Delagoa Bay and along the Zambesi, north to Egypt, no European Powers held territory on the East coast. Madagascar was free and Abyssinia also, and the Red Sea was unpossessed.[1]

From 1815, the year in which the condition of Africa was as I have just described until 1875, Europe extended its influence, but only slowly. There was no eager rush to stake off the continent. Germany had not set foot on the continent as a colonizing power, and France alone seemed anxious to absorb fresh territories. When Stanley pierced the interior and discovered the great waterway of the Congo, European interest awoke, and in 1884 the entrance of Germany precipitated the scramble for the continent.[2] Many causes had led to the German desire for colonies and for annexation of territory; and by 1884, the condition of the country at home, and its needs of markets abroad brought it on the stage as one of the great colonizing nations, and produced in Africa a situation like that produced by Germany in her annexation policy fifteen years later in China.[1] It is an interesting parallel also that the first raising of the flag of Germany on the soil of Africa grew out of the need of protecting the Rhenish missionaries in Namaqualand.[2] Germany's first venture led to considerable difficulty with Great Britain, for which, however, Great Britain was responsible, no one perceiving as yet that the scramble for Africa had begun, and that there could be no more of the easy-going methods that had hitherto prevailed. Once started, Germany pressed on, absorbing Toga land in the Gulf of Guinea, a huge section just above the equator in the Cameroons, and last of all, a yet greater slice in East Africa running inland from Zanzibar to the great lakes, all of these gains being made practically at the expense of Great Britain, or in districts where Great Britain would have inevitably established herself if Germany had not forestalled her.

---

[1] Keltie, *The Partition of Africa*, pp. 88–94.

[2] When years have passed by and England is still perceived seated in Egypt controlling the Suez Canal, and the Nile and the Sudan, historians will be likely to see in the frame of mind that led to the English tentative occupation of Egypt in 1882, an earlier preparation for the extension of European sovereignty over African soil, even as they will find in the virtual annexation of Egypt by England one more step in the providential opening of the Moslem world to Christian missions. It was the English occupation of Egypt which involved Great Britain in the Sudan, and which, if not now, will ultimately open the greater part of Mohammedan Africa to the preaching of Christ.

The rush of German expansion swept with it Great Britain, France, Italy and Belgium, and fixed the claims of Portugal and Spain. The Berlin Conference of 1884 and 1885 relieved the problem which arose of some of its perils. It disposed of Portugal's titles to vast tracts which it claimed, contending that occupation on the coast in order to be valid must be effective, and that the various Powers participating in the Conference must be notified in the event of any new occupation. The congress also dealt with the questions of the Congo region and of freedom of navigation on the Niger, and it was determined to establish in the heart of Africa the Congo Free State.

Not to go into detail in the long and intricate story of the partition of Africa, it is enough to say that now of the 11,512,000 square miles of Africa, France controls nearly four millions, Great Britain two and a half millions, not including the Boer Republics, Egypt, and what is now the Egyptian or British Sudan, which would add a million square miles, Portugal about eight hundred thousand, Spain a little less than two hundred thousand, Germany about a million and Italy two hundred thousand, and that practically nothing is left of independent Africa.[3] That it was far better for Africa and the world that the continent should thus have been absorbed by Europe, there can be no doubt. In no other way could its turbulence be stopped and the slave trade be suppressed. It is conceivable that in long centuries purely moral influences working among the people might have

---

[1] Reinsch, *World Politics*, Part IV.

[2] Keltie, *The Partition of Africa*, pp. 173ff.

[3] "Although there still remains much work for diplomatists and boundary commissions to do before the territorial limits of the various European Powers and native States in Africa have been accurately determined, the two arrangements which Lord Salisbury concluded in 1888 and 1899 with the French Gov-

ernment, the still more recent agreement with Germany, and the as yet unpublished agreement between France and Spain with reference to the Adrar country and the settlements on the Muni River have, broadly speaking, completed the partition of the continent. The scramble among the European Powers for protectorates and spheres of influence in Africa, which began fifteen or twenty years ago, developed during the intervening years into one of the most remarkable episodes of the nineteenth century, a century not wanting in events of the most profound interest to humanity. That the greater part of a continent which so recently played but an insignificant part in the politics of Europe should have been partitioned out among the Great Powers of Europe, without any recourse among themselves to the rude arbitrament of war, is at once a tribute to the statesmen who have guided the destinies of Europe during the last two decades, and a good augury for the future.

"With the fascinating story of the partition of a continent we do not propose to concern ourselves for the moment, but it may be useful, at the beginning of the new century to attempt a brief survey of the territorial results of the scramble now that some sort of modified finality appears to have been reached. It is necessary to speak with caution of 'finality' in such a connection. The partition is still a paper partition. It is cartographical rather than actual. But it marks, at least, a resting-place in the history of European intervention in Africa of which advantage may be taken to attempt a survey of the present territorial distribution of the continent. Such a survey can, of necessity, only be a rough approximation. Authorities differ, estimates vary, and it will be many years before the area and population of the various divisions of the African continent can be stated with any great degree of particularity. Indeed, so far as the estimates of population are concerned, authorities differ so widely that no practical purpose can be served by tabulating the rough guesses which have been made. To take the Congo Free State as a single example, Sir H. M. Stanley is still quoted as the authority for estimating the population of King Leopold's African kingdom at 39,000,000 while M. Mivien de Saint Martin gives the population as 14,000,000. Mr. Ravenstein puts it at 16,300,000, and another authority places it somewhere about 8,000,000. In face of such discrepancies it is plain that the wisest course is to wait for more trustworthy information before attempting to arrive at any estimate of the population of the African Continent.

"The total area of Africa is, in round figures, some eleven and a half million square miles. Except that Madagascar is included in French Africa, the various islands around the coast of the continent are left out of account in this calculation. Although the whole of the territory affected by the Anglo-French agreement of 1899 is not yet allocated, very material changes have been introduced in the administrative areas in the French Sudan. Indeed, the French Sudan has entirely disappeared as an administrative unit. Large additions have been made to the existing colonies of Senegal, Guinea, the Ivory Coast and Dahomey, and the remainder of the old Sudan administrative area has been divided into military districts which, although under direct military administration, are yet dependent on the Governor-General of French West Africa, a post occupied by a civil official. Over the greater part of the Sahara no attempt has yet been made to extend French jurisdiction, either civil or military, but an expedition is at this moment engaged in reducing to subjection the Twat group of oases which lie to the produced a voluntary and more or less indigenous civilization; and it is true also that European rule has its vices and short-comings; but no one can deny that the partition of Africa has resulted in immense progress and is sure to issue in increasing good. And in any event,

south of Morocco in the Western Sahara. Recent expeditions which have passed round the northern end of Lake Chad to the Shari region, are reported to have concluded treaties with the chiefs in Kanem, but for practical purposes the group of Central African States around Lake Chad may be dealt with separately. Certainly the powerful State, Wadai, which is included within the French sphere of influence by the agreement of 1899, has not been even nominally reduced into possession. The Sahara is also dealt with separately, except that the comparatively small portion attached to Algeria has been retained under the head of Algerian Sahara. The vexed question where British East Africa ends and the Egyptian Sudan begins has not yet received an authoritative answer, but the tenth parallel of northern latitude has been taken, for the present purpose, as roughly indicating the line of division between the British and the Anglo-Egyptian spheres of influence.

"The following table must be taken as a rough approximation only, except in the more settled regions of the north and south of the continent:—

BRITISH.

	Sq. Miles.		Sq. Miles.
Cape Colony	277,151	British East Africa including Nile Basin, 10 deg. North,	670,000
Natal and Zululand	29,434	Somaliland	68,000
Basutoland	10,293	Northern Nigeria	310,000
Bechuanaland	386,200	Niger Coast (Southern Nigeria)	21,500
Transvaal Colony	119,139	Lagos and Yoruba	20,500
Orange River Colony	48,326	Gold Coast and Hinterland	74,500
Rhodesia	600,000	Sierra Leone	33,100
British Central Africa Protectorate	42,217	Gambia	3,550

Total 2,713,910 square miles.

FRENCH.

Algeria proper	184,474	Bagirmi, Wadai, Kanem	126,000
Algerian Sahara	123,500	Ivory Coast	119,500
Tunis	51,000	Dahomey	59,000
Senegal	182,000	Sahara (including Tibesti)	1,892,000
Guinea	92,000	Somaliland	14,000
Sudan Military Districts	183,000	Madagascar	228,500
Congo and Gaban	550,000		

Total 3,804,974 square miles.

GERMAN.

East Africa	385,000	Cameroons	191,130
Southwest Africa	322,450	Togoland	34,800

Total 933,380 square miles.

ITALIAN.

Erithrea	88,500	Somaliland	100,000

Total 188,500 square miles.

it was impossible that the civilized world should tolerate such an open and unwashed sore.

It would be easy to single out other instances of the relation of

Portuguese.

Guinea	4,394	East Africa	301,000
Angola	484,730		

Total 790,124 square miles.

Spanish.

Rio de Oro	167,400	Muni River	1,750

Total 169,150 square miles.

Turkish.

Tripoli and Bengazi 398,900 square miles.

Nominally under Turkish suzerainty.

Egypt.

Egypt proper	400,000	Anglo-Egyptian Sudan	610,000

Total 1,010,000 square miles.

Separate States.

Congo Free State	900,000	Morocco	219,000
Liberia	52,000	Abyssinia	320,000

Total 1,491,000 square miles.

"Summarizing the totals thus obtained, we arrived at the following result: —

	Sq. miles.		Sq. Miles.
British	2,713,910	Spanish	169,150
French	3,804,974	Turkish	398,900
German	933,380	Egyptian	1,010,000
Italian	188,500	Separate States	1,491,000
Portuguese	790,124		

Total 11,499,938 square miles.

"It is probable that, as regards the areas in the above table, they are over, rather than under estimated, for the natural tendency is to exaggerate rather than to diminish the extent of one's possessions. But, taking the figures for what they are worth, it is apparent that the three principal participants in the scramble have not done at all badly. Germany, a comparatively late comer in the field, has secured close on a million square miles in four 'Estates,' three of which at least are well populated and afford abundant opportunity for the exercise of the traditional qualities of her people. In the matter of the superficial extension of her possessions France is an easy first, though we should run her close if Egypt and the Egyptian Sudan were added to Great Britain's African possessions. It is true that the sands of the Sahara give, as yet, little promise of commercial advantage to France, but both on the Mediterranean and on the West Coast France has colonies which, if properly administered, should prove a source of permanent prosperity to the Republic. If the number of actual or prospective customers were taken as the test, it is certain that Great Britain would be ahead of all competitors, while in the thickly populated basin of the Congo the Sovereign of the Free State has command of markets which should at some future time prove of great value to the commerce of Europe" (London *Times*, quoted in *The Christian Express*, June 1, 1901).

missions to the partitionment of Africa than the case of the Rhenish missionaries in Namaqualand.[1] It was the missionaries who saved Nyassaland and Uganda to Great Britain, and who in doing so saved these lands to themselves. Uganda was held for Great Britain by distinctively missionary contributions made for the purpose. The British East Africa Company, which was developing the territory about Victoria Nyanza, found itself unable to continue an expenditure of £40,000, which was proving unfruitful, and in 1891 resolved to withdraw unless the amount needed for one more year's retention of the field could be secured, in the hope that by the end of the year, as happened, the Government would take up the matter. Sir Wm. Mackinnon, the President of the Company, offered to give £10,000, and could get the rest from friends, if the Church Missionary Society would raise from its friends £15,000. The society met this offer. Not by the efforts of missionaries on the field alone, who were drawing the people of Uganda to righteousness, but by direct missionary gifts at home was the British Government saved from a withdrawal which the London *Times* declared, "might well assume the proportions of a national disaster," including "the entire collapse of the policy which, whether as regards the slave trade, or the development of the Africa continent," the Government had been following. In what is now British Central Africa, moreover, the Scotch missionaries conquered to civilization and held for enlightenment a great section of country long before the forces of European Government came in on their track, and supported by the sanctions of Government what the missionaries had established by influence. "Where international effort has failed," said Mr. Joseph Thomson, after visiting the Central African Lake region in 1879, only four years after the establishment of the mission at Livingstonia, "an unassuming mission supported only by a small section of the British people, has been quietly and unostentatiously, but most successfully, realizing in its own district the entire programme of the Brussels Conference (of 1876). I refer to the Livingstonia Mission of the Free Church of Scotland. This mission has proved itself in every sense of the word a civilizing centre. By it slavery has been stopped, desolating wars put an end to, and security given to a wide area of country."[2] "The missionaries took the first important steps towards opening South Central Africa to British supremacy which . . . they have done more than any other class of men to secure."[1]

---

[1] See Mackenzie, *John Mackenzie.*

[2] *To the Central African Lakes and Back*, Vol. II, p. 277.

If sometimes the progress of European annexation has been favourable to missions, there have been other cases when it was distinctly otherwise, as in the sad history of Madagascar. Early in the last century the Hova tribes acquired dominant authority over the other tribes, and King Radama I founded the first dynasty. As soon as he was settled on his throne he began to introduce great reforms. Almost at the beginning a mission of the London Missionary Society was encouraged to settle at the capital, Antananarivo, and began to reduce the language of the people to writing, and to supply a literature. Such was their success that Christianity seemed likely to prevail throughout the country, but when Queen Ranavalona I came to the throne, persecutions were begun which resulted in the martyrdom of hundreds of Christians—though Christianity continued to spread—and in the expulsion of the missionaries. Under the succeeding king the missionaries returned, but he lost his life in a revolution brought on by his signing when intoxicated at the house of the French Consul, a sweeping concession to a French Company. Under his successor the mission work continued to grow with astonishing success, and met with such encouragement from the sovereign, in the case of Ranavalona III, herself a Christian, that in 1883 there were 1,100 churches and 1,200 schools. The shadows fell when the French under cover of pretexts as unjust as any Christian Government ever invented, began to invade the rights of Madagascar, established a protectorate which was recognized by Lord Salisbury in 1890, and at last, in 1896, made it after further war, a French colony, shattering, at the same time, temporarily at least, the splendid work of the London Missionary Society, and trampling upon the Protestant Christianity of the people, while French dominion offered to the Papacy the opportunity to use something more than mere moral suasion to carry out the desire long entertained of winning to the Catholic faith, not the heathen so much, as the hosts of native Christians converted through the London Society's missionaries. The Apostolic Prefect in Madagascar in his letter to Pope Pius IX frankly avowed his purpose: "Happily these Christians whose whole Christianity consists in reading the Bible, do not appear to have prejudice against Catholicity, and we have grounds to hope that they will soon see the enormous difference between the cold and erroneous teachings of Protestantism and the immense resources which the holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church offers to them with its touching dogmas, the unity of its faith, the pomp of its worship, the treasures of its charity, the grace of its sacraments, and the all powerful virtue of the holy sacrifice of the altar."[1] And now at last the field is clear and the Roman Catholic missionaries are free to invade the work which the Protestant missionaries had built up, and to show that an absence of prejudice while admirable in native Protestant Christians capable of being proselytized into the Catholic Church, is not tolerable in Catholic missionaries dealing with the men who taught these heathen Hovas to love the Bible and to read it with open mind.

---

[1] Mackenzie, *John Mackenzie*, p. 58.

A word should be said before leaving the subject of the political partition of Africa, about the Congo Free State which grew out of the Conference of Berlin. The origin of the State, however, runs back even further to the Brussels Conference of 1876, which the King of Belgium called to consider the questions of the exploration and civilization of Africa, the best way to open the interior, and the suppression of the trade in slaves. At that time the Congo River had not been traced, and the issue of the Conference was practically the appointment of National Committees and the establishment of an International African Association. After the Adjournment of the Conference and the publication of Stanley's discoveries, the Association grew into the International Congo Association, which by 1884 had become a sort of State, and the United States Government recognized its flag as that of a friendly Government. Germany did the same, and at the Berlin Conference the Association was acknowledged as an independent power under the sovereignty of the King of Belgium. The establishment of the Congo Free State on this international basis was one great gain of the movement for the development of Africa. The State has become more or less of a Belgian institution, but its establishment opened up an immense Territory of nearly 100,000 square miles to free missionary work.[1] And the agency by which this was done was the exploratory work of one who owed his interest in Africa and his impulse to exploration to David Livingstone, who was the first white man to look upon the upper waters of the Congo, though he did not recognize them, and to pierce the forests and ford the streams of the territories which had now become the Congo Free State.

---

[1] Stock, *History of the Church Missionary Society*, Vol. II, p. 474; Latimer, *Europe in Africa in the Nineteenth Century*, Ch. XVI; Lovett, *History of the London Missionary Society*, Vol. I, pp. 790–792; Cousins, *Madagascar of To-day.*

It must be regretfully admitted that the happy expectations with which the Free State was established have not all been realized. The Aborigines' Protection Society recently made appeal to the British Government that the Powers which were responsible for handing over a million square miles of Africa to the King of the Belgians should inquire how his practically absolute powers have been employed.

> "The allegation of the Society, which they are ready to support with masses of evidence, is that, whatever His Majesty's intentions, the practical effect of the system he has permitted to grow up is to subject a great portion of the black tribes entrusted to his care to sufferings such as even the Arab slave-raiders never inflicted. The first necessity of the new State, as of all States, was revenue, partly to pay the expenses of administration, and partly to repay the King for his very large preliminary outlay; and unfortunately there was no usual source from which it could be obtained. The people were too poor to pay direct taxes, the growth of revenue from indirect taxes was too slow, and the Government was driven to the expedient of sanctioning a monopoly. The Administration first declared that all wild land in the State, probably nine-tenths of its whole area

---

[1] Keltie, *The Partition of Africa*, pp. 209–223; 118–133. Some of the missionary agencies are not well satisfied with the present attitude of the State. *The Kassai Herald*, published at Luebo by the missionaries of the Southern Presbyterian Church, says in an editorial note on July 1, 1903:

"We notice with much regret that the new concessions asked for by the English Baptist Missionary Society above Stanley Falls have been refused by the State. Mr. Arthington of Leeds, Eng., gave $50,000 to open up this work. Shortly after, he died, and in his will left about $200,000 more to establish this chain of stations from the Congo River to Lake Tanganyika, thus joining with the Church Missionary Society's field and girdling Africa from ocean to ocean with successive mission stations.

"Thus we have the spectacle of the 'Philanthropic' Congo Free State throwing a barrier to further mission enlargement on the upper Congo, as they have for some time so systematically done in the Kassai in connection with our own mission."

The same paper states in its issue of Oct. 1, 1903:

"It is now an undisputed fact that the work of missions in the Congo Free State is being curtailed by the State authorities refusing to grant any new concessions, while laws have been passed prohibiting any foreigner to remain for any length of time in one place unless having received a grant of land by lease or sale from the State."

was the property of the Crown; and then utilized this property by selling monopolies of the rubber grown on this wild land to different companies, the State usually retaining, according to the Aborigines' Protection Society, half the profits. The companies set to work, and soon saw their way to large dividends; but a difficulty arose. The people were discontented with their rewards for gathering the rubber, which by tradition, we must remember belonged to themselves, and practically refused to gather it. As submission to this refusal would have dislocated the whole machinery of Government, compulsion was employed, and the methods of compulsion were, according to the evidence before the Society, of a most shocking kind. The only force at the disposal of the State was composed of the wildest tribes, often cannibals, who for the sake of protection and some pay undertook the task, who were provided with modern arms, and who were then let loose upon the people. Their method was to surround a village, order out its adults upon a rubber hunt, and if resisted, or if the rubber brought in was insufficient, to kill, mutilate, or in some instances, as the Society affirms, *eat* the defaulters. If the natives fled they were hunted in the woods, and if they fought their heads or hands were brought into the stations in evidence that the resistance had been put down. The Society believes that hundreds were sold into slavery, and that, in short, in the recalcitrant districts the worst crimes of the Arab slave-raiders were repeated, while no attempt was made to establish the kind of savage order with which the Arabs, to do them justice, in many districts partly compensated the people. The Congo State has, in fact, according to the Society's Report, and if its facts are truly stated, become a plague spot in Africa, and its people, naturally submissive enough, are becoming so savage that the very sight of a European inclines them either to flight or mutiny."[1]

There have, of course, been counter statements in defence of the Congo Free State administration, but the evidence of instances of misgovernment and injustice is unanswerable. The net result of the experiment it is too soon to estimate.[2] A writer in the New York *Sun*, however, is sure that the net result is good, and it is difficult not to believe with him that, whatever the abuses, the conditions must be a great improvement over the situation in the Congo before the Free State was established. "After all," says the writer, "however heinous the crimes of which not a few Congo natives have been the hapless victims, the evil that has been done by white men in that region seems but a drop in the bucket in comparison with the seeds for good that have been sown and are bearing fruit."[1]

---

[1] *London Spectator*, quoted in *The Christian Express*, May 1, 1902.

[2] Bourne, *Civilization in Congoland;* "A Belgian," *The Truth about the Civilization in Congoland*, set forth the two sides, the former in accusation, the latter in defence. See *Review of Reviews*, July, 1903, pp. 33-42. Cf. the ominous despatch from Brussels in the New York *Sun*, Dec. 11, 1903:

"BRUSSELS, Dec. 10.—Despatches received here say that the effect of the campaign against the conduct of affairs in the Congo is being felt throughout the Free State. Several agents say that it will be impossible for the exploitation companies, which have concessions, to continue their work under the new régime, *which allows natives to prosecute whites for maltreatment.*" Why not?

Prior to the struggle for actual territorial possession in Africa, which began with the advent of Germany in 1884, the great interest of European Governments in Africa and their chief reason for correspondence regarding Africa had been over the slave trade, first the Christian slave trade, and then the Arab and Mohammedan slave trade. It is characteristic that the Christian nations first suppressed their own trade and then turned to put down the worse traffic of the Mohammedans, and that not only did no Mohammedan Power put forth any real efforts to suppress the trade, but that it is only Mohammedan Powers which to-day protect or permit the traffic. As far back as 1441 slaves were brought from Africa to Europe, and were "given as first fruits to the Pope."[2] The discovery of America gave a great impulse to the trade, and in the first decade of the following century, a Papal bull authorized the opening of a slave market in Lisbon. The Papal decree which gave the Western World to Spain, closed Africa to her, and assigned it to Portugal, and thus threw into the hands of other nations than Spain the privilege of carrying slaves from their African homes to the Spanish dependencies. This trade became a monopoly, and different nations contended for the privilege of holding the contract for supplying the Spanish colonies with 4,800 negroes annually. In 1562 an act was passed by the English Parliament legalizing the purchase of slaves, and in the hundred years preceding 1786, the number of slaves imported into British Colonies exceeded 2,000,000. Even as late as 1830, 250,000 slaves were exported every year from Africa by Christian States.

Long before this, however, opposition to the trade had sprung up. In 1772 the Lord Chief Justice of England, Mansfield, ruled, "As soon as any slave sets his foot on English ground he becomes free." In 1807, the slave trade was declared illegal for all British subjects, and the same year the United States forbade the further introduction of slaves. In 1834, Great Britain abolished her West Indian slavery, leaving Latin America as the only market for African slaves in the Western Hemisphere. And even Spanish and Portuguese possessions

[1] *Sun*, November 2, 1903, art. "Talk with an Africanist." See Senate *Document No. 282*, 58th Congress, 2d Session.

[2] Thornton, *Africa Waiting*, p. 122.

were no longer a legitimate market, for in 1815, a Congress of the Powers in Vienna, and another in 1822, at Verona, had declared that the trade was repugnant to humanity, and that it must be abolished. Such simple declarations failing to stop the traffic, it was agreed by the Powers in the Treaty of 1841, "to prohibit all trade in slaves under their respective flags, to declare such traffic piracy, and to grant under certain conditions the reciprocal right of search of their respective merchant-vessels by their ships of war."[1] The following year by the Ashburton Treaty, Great Britain and the United States agreed to maintain jointly a naval force on the African coast, to intercept and capture slave ships. By this means and by "the abolition of slavery in all countries professing the Christian religion," as Lord Vivian said at the Brussels Conference of 1889–90, the Transatlantic slave trade, the horror of which was a disgrace to civilization, entirely ceased.

While the slave trade under Christian nations decreased until it died, the Mohammedan trade grew steadily during the first part of the last century. The cessation of white slavery in Turkey, the rise of the Senusi, and the transformation of the Fullah shepherds into Moslem warriors and their consequent jehads or religious wars, in which the enslavement of unbelievers is a meritorious thing, were among the causes of the increase of the Moslem trade.[2] The Moslem traders have devastated three great regions, the West Sudan, whose caravans moved north to Tripoli, the East Sudan, whose victims have been taken to Mecca, the great Mohammedan slave mart, and East Africa, whose ports of embarkation were Pemba and Zanzibar. It was this last traffic whose atrocities David Livingstone saw, and against which he stirred the holy wrath of Christendom. His stone in Westminster Abbey justly declares that this was one of his great achievements;—"an unwearied effort to abolish the desolating slave trade,"—yet he died in the midst of its horrors, knowing not, as *Punch* said,

"That the trumpet he had blown
Out of the darkness of that dismal land
Had reached and roused an army of its own,
To strike the chains from the slave's fettered hand."

---

[1] British Blue Book, *Africa*, No. 8 A., 1890, p. 8.
[2] Thornton, *Africa Waiting*, pp. 125f.

And what Livingstone did, scores of missionaries have done since.[1] It is true that the general elevation of moral sentiment in civilized lands has made the idea of human slavery intolerable. But it is also true that this change has been wrought by Christianity, and that in England, America and elsewhere, it was the voice of Christians raised in the name of Christianity that made assault upon the institution of slavery and secured its overthrow, and it is true also that it was the unceasing representation of missionaries, Catholic as well as Protestant, that has kept Europe aroused. Cardinal Lavigerie aroused France in behalf of the slaves of the Western Sudan. The Livingstonia missionaries stirred Scotland for the sufferers of Nyassaland, and travellers and merchants bore constant confirmatory testimony of the hideous horrors of the infamous trade. As late as 1885, Mr. Moir described his meeting with "a polished Arab gentleman named Kobunda who had just converted a smiling valley called the Garden of Tanganyika, into a hungry wilderness, and he had the privilege of seeing him set out to Zanzibar with the ivory he had collected." This was Mr. Moir's picture:

> "First came armed men dancing, gesticulating and throwing their guns, as only Arabs can do, to the sound of drums, panpipes and other less musical instruments. Then followed, slowly and sedately, the great man himself, accompanied by his brother and other head men, his richly caparisoned donkey walking along near by; and surely no greater contrast could be conceived than that between this courteous, white robed Arab, with his gold-embroidered joho, silver sword and daggers, and silken turban, and the miserable swarm of naked, squalid human beings that he had wantonly dragged from their now ruined homes in order to enrich himself.
>
> "Behind the Arab came wives and household servants, laughing and talking as they passed along, carrying the camp utensils and other impedimenta of their masters. After that the main rabble of the caravan, the men armed with guns, spears and axes. Ominously prominent among the loads were many slave sticks to be handy if any turned refractory, or if any likely strangers were met. Mingling with and guarded by them came the wretched, over-burdened, tied-up slaves. The men who might still have had spirit to try and escape, were driven, tied two and two, in the terrible goree or taming stick, or in gangs of about a dozen, each with an iron collar let into a long iron chain, many even, so soon after the start, staggering under their loads.
>
> "And the women! I can hardly trust myself to think or speak of them—they were fastened to chains or thick bark ropes; very many in addition to their

---

[1] Dennis, *Christian Missions and Social Progress*, Vol. II., pp. 283–337.

heavy weight of grain or ivory, carried little brown babies dear to their hearts as a white man's child to his. The double burden was almost too much, and yet they struggled bravely on, knowing too well that when they showed signs of fatigue, not the slaver's ivory but the living child would be torn from them and thrown aside to die. One poor old woman I could not help noticing. She was carrying a biggish boy who should have been walking, but those thin, weak legs had evidently given way. She was tottering already ; it was the supreme effort of a mother's love—and all in vain ; for the child easily recognizable was brought into camp a couple of hours later by one of my hunters, who had found him on the path. We had him cared for, but his poor mother would never know. Already, during the three days' journey from Liendure, death had been freeing the captives. It was well for them ; still we could not help shuddering, as in the darkness we heard the howl of the hyenas along the track, and realized only too fully the reason why. Low as these poor negroes may be in the moral scale, they have still strong maternal affection, and love of home and country.

"For ninety miles along the south coast of Tanganyika we have the entire population swept away."[1]

Such a temperate account as this of a slave caravan will indicate in a measure what a problem of agony missionaries had to face. When a troop of Arab slavers came down upon villages where the missionaries had worked, or marched a terrified group of slaves past the mission stations, or when a fugitive slave tapped on a missionary's window in the night, what were they to do? It was more than flesh and blood could stand to look upon such agony and satanic cruelty. Yet before the era of annexation nothing could be done. Some missions felt compelled to adopt the policy of giving sanctuary to refugee slaves, protecting them in the mission stations "on condition that no crime could be proved against them within a month, and that they were willing to work out their ransom. They were to live in the mission settlement until they had earned the price which the slave owner had paid for them." And when slaves did not flee to the missions, it was still impossible that Christian missionaries should be able quietly to bear the sight of the slave horrors. But the missionaries were told by their Governments that they should not interfere. Earl Granville informed the Scotch missionaries that the only rights they had were those conceded by the chief in whose country they resided. Yet "however much non-interference," wrote Dr. Laws, "is correct theoretically—and I uphold it as the best order that could have been given on the subject—there is still in the breast of every free born Briton such a hatred of the horrid traffic, that where one comes across a gang of poor, half-starved, way-worn fellow creatures, on their way to the coast—if not first in their graves—and is morally certain that a word from his lips or a flash from his eye is enough to set them all at liberty, need it be wondered that the temptation to do what is at the moment good for these creatures, would overcome the patient waiting which the judgment of calmer moments pronounces to be the better plan."[1] The end of such painful waiting came in the region around Tanganyika which the Arabs had devastated so in 1887 that one missionary wrote, "Six years ago when the road to Tanganyika was opened, there was a village every six or eight miles all along the way. Now you can travel for three or four days and scarcely see a village or meet a creature,"[2] when all that territory was absorbed by Great Britain, the Congo Free State and Germany. And generally throughout Africa there has been no hope whatever of the suppression of the trade save as the European occupation held the Arabs in check in British, French and German territory and the higher opinion of these nations came to coerce the support of Spain and Portugal, and to terminate their connivance at the traffic in their possessions. Both these Governments and the Sultan of Turkey and the Shah of Persia were represented at and assented to the agreement of the Brussels Conference of 1889–1890, which declared: "The Powers exercising a sovereignty or a protectorate in Africa, confirm and give precision to their former declarations, and undertake to proceed gradually, as circumstances permit, either by the means above indicated, or by other means which they may consider suitable, with the repression of the slave trade, each State in its respective possessions and under its own direction. Whenever they consider it possible they will lend their good offices to the Powers which, with a purely humanitarian object may be engaged in Africa upon a similar mission." And one of the four means alluded to as stated in the preceding article of the General Act of the Conference was "To protect without distinction of creed, the missions which are already or are about to be established."[3]

---

[1] *Church Missionary Intelligencer*, August, 1888, pp. 505f.

The predominant motive in territorial annexation, however, has not been philanthropic, but commercial or imperial, imperial in the case of France, Spain, Italy and Portugal, and commercial, or the two combined, in the case of Great Britain and Germany. One of the first instances of annexation, indeed the first in the case of Great Britain, was purely philanthropic. In 1786, the Government, urged on by Granville Sharp, who had secured the judgment of 1772, declaring slavery illegal on English soil, purchased twenty miles square from a native chief, on the land where Hawkins had kidnapped the first British slave cargo, and sent thither four hundred liberated negro slaves, hoisted the British flag, and began in this way the Colony of Sierra Leone, intended to be a place of refuge and a home for freed slaves.[1] The chief purpose in almost all other cases was commercial, either to protect a trade already established by individual enterprise, or to make way for a trade to be established, or political for the sake of sharing in the spoils of a continent divided without any possibility of consultation of the will of the people to whom it had belonged.

---

[1] Jack, *Daybreak in Livingstonia*, pp. 199–201.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 207.

[3] British Blue Book, *Africa*, No. 8 A, 1890, p. 175.

One interesting form of the commercial development is found in the absorption of large tracts of country under the care and administration of trading companies. For years great territories have been held thus under British influence, though not under the British crown. The Royal Niger Company, Chartered, and the British South Africa Company, Chartered, had immense responsibilities, and were actually Governments. Indeed this was almost the earliest method of Europe in her exploration and extension. The East India Company, the most famous of all such organizations, was incorporated under Elizabeth, and ever since, the device has been in use. This method enlists private capital and makes it of large personal advantage to the investors to make the most of the land and people under their care. It saves governments from all expense and work except to protect the chartered regions from the aggression of other powers, the preservation of peace and all internal administration resting with the Company. At the same time, it is a dangerous system, as the history of the East India Company shows, and it often covers, as in that history and in South Africa, moral compromises or international crimes like the Jameson Raid, which responsible Governments would be slower to commit.[2]

---

[1] Stock, *History of the Church Missionary Society*, Vol. I, p. 47.

[2] Dennis, *Eastern Problems at the Close of the Eighteenth Century*, pp. 36ff.

While the system is capable of abuse it is also capable of Christian use, and there have been several companies formed as commercial organizations for the purpose of trade, which were willing to take out their dividends in philanthropy, and the inspiring purpose of whose creation was the missionary impulse. It was to promote the safety and prosperity of the people of Sierra Leone that the Sierra Leone Company was formed in 1791, to introduce trade, industry and Christian knowledge. Its chairman was Henry Thornton, later treasurer of the Church Missionary Society, and among its directors was Wilberforce, the liberator of the slaves, and one of the first vice-presidents of the Church Missionary Society. The first organized effort on England's part to open the Niger region, was made by the Society for the Civilization of Africa, which Fowell Buxton organized under the conviction that "It is the Bible and the Plow that must regenerate Africa." A Government expedition set out, accompanied by scientific men sent by the society, and Buxton organized an agricultural society to establish a model farm somewhere on the Niger. The expedition and the society failed, but the day came when the chartered Niger Company took up this work and carried it to some real measure of success.

Reference has been already made to the relation of missionaries to the East Africa Company in Uganda. An even more striking instance of the part played by the missionary spirit in promoting and extending legitimate commerce and the conditions which it requires, is found in the history of the African Lakes Corporation. The Scotch missionaries from the beginning perceived that the whole level of life in Africa must be lifted, and that to this end there must be honest industry and trade. Otherwise the slave traffic would go on and the people with only a few animal wants easily supplied, would continue to live brute lives. "We ought to encourage the Africans," wrote Livingstone in 1856, "to cultivate for our markets as the most effectual means, next to the Gospel, of their elevation." From the outset the missionaries in Nyassaland as elsewhere, encouraged the people to acquire new industries, and to develop old ones, and to lay themselves out to supply the markets available, and to find new ones. At the same time, missionaries have ever felt that trade was a matter outside their direct duty, and that connection with it had grave dangers. The same question was before all missionary societies, and about the time Livingstone made the remark quoted, we find Henry Venn, of the Church Missionary Society manifesting great jealousy "of allowing trade to occupy the time or the thoughts of the missionaries," and "in his private journal we find him 'expounding to these missionaries the principles upon which they were to encourage native industry and lawful commerce without involving the missions in the charge of trading.'"[1] To escape these dangers, the Scotch supporters of the Livingstonia Mission formed, in 1877–78, The Livingstonia Central African Trading Company, better known as the African Lakes Corporation. The company at once set to work with Scotch energy and principle. It placed steamers on the river Zambesi and on Lake Tanganyika. It laid out systems of irrigation, introduced new products, commenced coffee raising, and built great roads. It refused to sell guns and ammunition to Arabs and other disturbers of the peace. It resolutely opposed the importation of liquor, and at the Berlin Conference of 1884, the Company succeeded in getting the traffic prohibited throughout the whole region. When it came to a crisis from which there was no escape, the company fought the Arab slavers to save from the savagery of their Moslem enemies the helpless people, whom the missionaries had been raising from the dirt. The Company sent out Christian men as its agents, and threw its whole influence on the side of the mission. By its work it aided the Livingstonia missionaries in laying immovably deep the foundations of the Christian Church in Nyassaland, and it helped to save a great region from depopulation by the slavers and desolation by the corrupt influence of Portuguese colonial administration.[2]

In two other ways the missionary enterprise has been of assistance to the commercial development of Africa. In the first place it has made of African converts better workmen and better customers. Doubtless there are exceptions, where misguided education has unfitted the people for their proper life duties; but in the main, by teaching sobriety and industry, by industrial schools and training, by increasing wants through raising the standards of life, the missionaries have directly assisted commerce. In the second place, they have by their own example counteracted much of the influence of the careless lives of many engaged in trade, and by their work done what they could to check the evils which trade has introduced, and which are fatal to trade itself. "The temporal misery of the whole Heathen World," said the instructions delivered to some of the first missionaries going to Africa in 1804, "has been dreadfully aggravated by its intercourse with men who bear the name of Christians; but the Western coast of Africa, between the Tropics, and more especially that part of it between the Line and the Tropic of Cancer, has not only in common with other heathen countries, received from us our diseases and our vices, but it has been the chief theatre of the inhuman slave trade."[1] More than seventy years

---

[1] Stock, *History of the Church Missionary Society*, Vol. I, p. 110.

[2] Jack, *Daybreak in Livingstonia*, Ch. XIII. "In order to perpetuate a scarcely less important branch of the movement initiated by Livingstone,—a department specially sanctioned by the English Government—the African Lakes Company was formed in 1878. Its object was to open up and develop the regions of East Central Africa from the Zambesi to Tanganyika; to make employments for the native peoples, to trade with them honestly, to keep out rum, and, so far as possible, gunpowder and firearms, and to coöperate and strengthen the hands of the missionary. It has already established twelve trading stations, manned by a staff of twenty-five Europeans and many native agents. The *Ilala* on Lake Nyassa belongs to it; and it has just placed a new steamer to supersede the *Lady Nyassa* on the river Shire. It has succeeded in starting a flourishing coffee plantation in the interior, and new sources of wealth are being gradually introduced. For the first time, on the large scale, it has taught the natives the meaning and the blessings of work. It has acted, to some extent, as a check upon the slave-

---

trade; it has prevented inter-tribal strife, and helped to protect the missionaries in time of war. The African Lakes Company, in short, modest as is the scale on which it works, and necessarily limited as are its opportunities, has been for years the sole administering hand in this part of Africa. This Company does not exist for gain;—or exists for gain only in the sense that commercial soundness is the only solid basis on which to build up an institution which can permanently benefit others. A large amount of private capital has been expended by this Company; yet, during all the years it has carried on its noble enterprise, it has re-invested in Africa all that it has taken from it. All this British capital, all the capital of the missions, all these various and not inconsiderable agencies, have been tempted into Africa largely in the hope that the old policy of England would not only be continued but extended. England has never in theory departed from the position she assumed in the days of the Zambesi Expedition. On the contrary, she has distinctly recognized the relation between her Government and Africa. She has continued to send out British Consuls to be the successors of Livingstone in the Nyassa region. When the first of these, Captain Foote, R. N., died in the Shire Highlands in 1884, the English Government immediately sent another to take his place. But this is the last thing that has been done. The Consul is there as a protest that England has still her eye on Africa. But Africa needs more than an eye. And when, as happened the other day, one of Her Majesty's representatives was under Arab fire for five days and nights on the shores of Lake Nyassa, this was brought home to us in such practical fashion as to lead to the hope that some practical measures will now be taken" (Drummond wrote thus of the relation of Government and trade and missions in 1888, in *Tropical Africa*, pp. 81–83).

[1] Stock, *History of the Church Missionary Society*, Vol. I, p. 95.

later a negro writer in *Frazer's Magazine*, Dr. Blyden, still felt obliged to say, "Another drawback . . . to the success of missions on the coast is the pernicious example of European traders and other non-missionary residents. From the time of the discovery of the negro country by the Portuguese to the present, Europe has sent to the coast as traders, some of its vilest characters. . . . It is unfortunate for the English and other European languages that, in this part of Africa, they have come to the greater portion of the natives associated with profligacy, plunder and cruelty, and devoid of any connection with spiritual things."[1] Immorality, greed, injustice are not likely to dispose the minds of people in a friendly way, and vice and disease do not qualify them for industry and fit them to develop trade. The missionaries have directly helped the larger commercial interests of the West by the good example of clean lives, by the wholesome influence of their teaching, and by their success in making whole villages and tribes industrious and energetic and honest. Two of their greatest difficulties in doing this have been, as Mr. White points out, "the immoral practices of traders, and above all, the debasing and destructive traffic in cheap spirits."[2]

This traffic in liquor will be one of the terrible counts in the indictment which posterity will draw against Europe and America in their dealings with Africa. We have slowly rooted out the atrocious traffic in slaves only to plant in its place the equally abominable trade in strong drink. Some would say, more abominable. "It is my sincere belief," declared Sir Richard Burton, "that if the slave trade were revived with all its horrors, and Africa could get rid of the white man with the gunpowder and rum which he has introduced, Africa would be the gainer by the exchange." And Sir John Kirk goes so far as to declare : "The last four centuries of contact with Europeans and European trade has degraded rather than elevated or improved the people."[3] These are strong words, but scarcely a traveller and never a missionary sends back from Africa any other report. Joseph Thomson was a capable and in this matter an unbiased man, and no one had better opportunity for observation, and this was his testimony : "The notorious gin trade . . . is indeed a scandal and a shame, well worthy to be classed with the detested slave trade, in which we had ourselves ever so prominent a part. We talk of civilizing the negro and introducing the blessings of European trade, while at one and the same time we pour into this unhappy country incredible quantities of gin, rum, gunpowder and guns. We are so accustomed to hearing a delightful list of the useful articles which the negro wants in return for the products of his country that we are apt to think that the trade in spirits must be quite a minor affair. Banish all such pleasing illusions from your minds. The trade in this baneful article is enormous. The appetite for it increases out of all proportion to the desire for better things and to our shame be it said, we are ever ready to supply the victims to the utmost, driving them deeper and deeper into the slough of depravity, ruining them body and soul, while at home we talk sanctimoniously, as if the introduction of our trade and the elevation of the negro went hand in hand. The time has surely come when in the interests of our national honour, energetic efforts should be made to suppress the diabolical traffic. There can be no excuse for its continuance, and it is a blot on Christian civilization." [1] And again a year later, Mr. Thomson said regarding the Kru coast, and those very Kru boys whose use of liquor some travellers have defended as innocent and harmless, "In wandering through some of the native villages on the Kru coast, one feels as if in a kind of Hades, peopled by brutalized human beings, whose punishment it is to be possessed of a never ending thirst for drink. On all sides you are followed by eager cries for gin, gin, always gin. Under their eager appeals one seems to hear the bitter reproach, 'You see what you Christians have made us. You talk of peace and goodwill, and yet you put devils into us. Give us more drink that we may allay these cravings, and for a moment be allowed to forget our misery.' The boast of many a village on that unhappy line of coast, is the amount of liquor they can afford to drink, the guage of their wealth and its proudest monument, the pyramid of empty gin bottles which adorns its square." [2]

---

[1] Blyden, *Christianity, Islam and the Negro Race*, pp. 78, 79.

[2] *The Development of Africa*, p. 315.

[3] Harford-Battersby, *An International Question in Western Africa*, p. 9.

For years now this flood of liquor has poured into Africa. In 1884 the imports from Great Britain, America, Portugal and Germany were 8,751,527 gallons, of which 7,136,263 came from Germany, and 921,412 from America.[1] The imports in 1901 into British West Africa alone were 2,319,731 gallons of gin and 1,834,514 gallons of rum and whiskey. So firmly fixed has the cruel habit become, that in some parts of Africa gin is the only currency, and even the Roman Catholic missionaries use it for this purpose. It ruins the Africans physically, enslaves whole villages, men, women and children, and in the end it is as surely the death of trade as the slave traffic itself. Some of the most bitter denunciations of it, accordingly, have come from the better class of traders and from Government officials.[2] But the most constant and earnest protest has been from the missionaries and the natives whom they have influenced. "The slave trade has been to Africa a great evil," says the Rev. James Johnson, a native clergyman of Lagos, now Bishop Johnson, "but the evils of the rum trade are far worse. I would rather my countrymen were in slavery and being worked hard and kept away from the drink, than that the drink should be let loose upon them. The liquor imported into these colonies (the Niger region) has risen from a few hundred thousand gallons to 1,231,000 gallons yearly (in 1887), of which something like 1,205,760 is what is known as 'trade gin and rum,' vile, destructive stuff. In the town of Lagos, with 35,000 population there are fifty licensed houses." And Chief Khama of the Bamangwato in his pathetic appeal to the British Representative in Bechuanaland, declared, "It were better for me that I should lose my country than that I should be flooded with drink. But to fight against drink is to fight against demons and not against men. I dread the white man's drink more than all the assegais of the Matebale which kill men's bodies and it is quickly over, but drink puts devils into men and destroys both their souls and their bodies forever. Its wounds never heal. I pray Your Honour never ask me to open a little door to the drink."[3] So also the

---

[1] *Manchester Geographical Magazine*, January 27, 1886.

[2] Harford-Battersby, *An International Question in Western Africa*, p. 7.

---

[1] "The exports of rum from the United States for the year ending June 30, 1903, were 1,096,719 gallons valued at $1,458,393. Judged by previous years, ninety to ninety-five per cent. of this went to Africa" (Pamphlet "The King's Business Requires Haste," by Samuel B. Capen, LL. D. An address delivered at the American Board's Annual Meeting, at Manchester, N. H., October 15, 1903).

[2] *Trafficking in Liquor with the Natives of Africa*, pp. 7, 8, 23, 30.

[3] In 1900 Khama sent the following quaint letter to the editor of the London Missionary Society *Chronicle:*

PALAPYE, 11th December, 1900.

If you please Mr. Editor-of-the-newspaper, I crave a little of your paper; put these words in.

Emir of Nupe wrote to Bishop Crowther, "The matter about which I am speaking with my mouth, write it; it is as if done by my hand; it is not a long matter; it is about rum. Rum, rum, rum, it has ruined my country; it has ruined my people; it has made my people become mad. I have given a law that no one dares buy or sell it, any one who is found selling it, his house is to be plundered, any one found drunk is to be killed. I have told all the Christian traders that I agree to everything for trade except rum. Tell Crowther, the great Christian minister, that he is our father. I beg you don't forget this writing, because we all beg that he should beg the great priests that they should beg the English Queen to prevent the bringing of rum into this land. For God and the prophet's sake, for God and the prophet His messenger's sake, he must help us in this matter, that of

I ask friends about the words which I hear frequently in the papers. You say concerning me that I have "destroyed" my town for the sake of forbidding the drink. And I say to you people who are black as I myself am, is the word which you speak spoken significantly, showing well the deeds with which you have saved your towns, your lands, and your people, by means of the drink? I am told of the carefulness with which a man of drink preserves his things and his people nicely. I am also told the names of chiefs who have preserved their towns beautifully by means of liquor. I am not told indistinctly: I am told facts which are apparent to the tribes, to the guardian of the whole land (which is the Government—the mother of us all) and to the missionaries—the speakers of the Word of the Lord Jesus, who are witnesses to the whole truth.

I myself will show you how I have "destroyed" my town on account of drink. In the olden days we were given to liquor; and there was great destruction among us. By giving heed to the matter I found that the drink was the beginning of the destruction. And in 1875 I forbade European liquors in my town; but the destruction and the disputes did not cease. In 1876 I forbade Sechuana liquors; and then it was that disputes ceased. There were also many chieftains, my younger brothers, who liked it very much; but I persuaded them to leave it alone. In 1895, however, one of my people began to make beer to drink in my town. I went and called him and asked him how he came to bring drink into my town. But my younger brothers, whom I had induced to refrain from drinking liquor, began to defend him strongly, and fought me, refusing all my entreaties. Then the quarrel began in earnest, and it was "beer! beer!" and the quarrel continued. And now you can ask all those who drew away a portion of my town from me by means of drink whether they have lived together. Their towns are scattered where they went to reside. They could not govern one another either. That is the fact!

And I, whom you call a destroyer, I ask you, who is he among you black people who has preserved his people by means of drink, and can touch me in the matter of people, or land, or actual Government? As for me, I do govern. I have people; I have a country; I am taken up nicely by the Government of the Queen, which neither hinders me nor takes anything from me oppressively. Of course, it does not find me drinking any of the land in liquor, or selling any part of it. And the part of my country which is in the hands of the Queen was not obtained by purchase nor by robbery; it was an agreement between me and the rum. We all have confidence in him; he must not leave our country to be spoiled by rum."[1]

Of course the real motive for the liquor traffic back of all the concocted defences made for it, is the desire for gain, or the necessity for revenue. *West Africa* frankly says: "Take the hypothesis of a total abolition of the liquor traffic—how would the colonies replace the revenue they derive from the taxation on spirit imports? . . . As the revenue from spirits forms about sixty per cent. of the total, the part which spirits play in the administration of British West Africa has to be faced."[2]

But against even the strongest interests, real progress has been made in the restriction of the African liquor trade. The resolution adopted at the Berlin Conference in 1884, was tepid and innocuous: "The Powers represented at the Conference desiring that the indigenous population may be guarded against the evils arising from the abuse of strong drinks, avow their wish that an agreement may be established between them to regulate the difficulties which might arise on this subject in such a manner as to conciliate the rights of humanity with the interests of commerce, in so far as these interests may be legitimate." At the Brussels Slave Trade Conference in 1889–90, the

Queen's Government. But you, where are your lands? O, ye righteous chiefs! You who have preserved your towns by means of drink. And further, I remove a person who breaks the law. But I ask you, friends, you who upbraid me thus in the papers, do you really govern? Have you any towns? Or have you any people? Or have you any countries? Answer me. I have, I govern; I am happily a Government man; and I have seen nothing to hinder me in my own country. I am taken up beautifully by the Government of the Queen, and so are my people. And they who say that I have destroyed my town on account of my hatred of drink, let them sign their names as I do, so that I may know who they are. How I shall rejoice if you speak right.

And again, can you show me a great town of drunkenness which is either rich or righteous? I will believe it when I see it. But if you cannot show it me, I can have no agreement whatever with deeds of drunkenness. And I say again, I know what excuses you make, saying that the white people have taken your land from you. That is a mere excuse; you drank it, selling it while you were its masters.

And so I beg the Government to stand by me and help me that the drink may not enter my town. And I want you to know that although you may upbraid me on account of the drink, I am not a bit alarmed.

May the Government of the Queen become strong to make an end of this great enemy of the country—I mean the drink.

Be greeted. I am KHAMA (son) OF SEKGOMA,
Chief of the Bamangwato.

---

[1] *Paper prepared for Church Congress at Exeter*, 1894, pp. 15, 17.

[2] *West Africa*, Vol. II, No. 33, August 3, 1901, p. 90.

subject came up again, missionary bodies having given it constant agitation, and a great zone was marked off between the twentieth degree of north latitude and the twenty-second degree of south latitude and the Atlantic and Indian Oceans, with dependencies and islands within one hundred miles of the shore, and it was agreed that within that zone wherever "either on account of religious belief or from other motives, the use of distilled liquors does not exist or has not been developed, the Powers shall prohibit their importation," and manufacture, save for the consumption of foreigners. It was also agreed that a certain import duty be levied throughout this whole zone upon liquors introduced into territories from which the foregoing provisions did not exclude them.[1] A second Conference at Brussels was held in 1899, and it was then decided to maintain the existing zones of prohibition, to increase the duties where imports were allowed, and to hold another Conference in six years for further revision; and the Conference expressed the hope that each Power would take steps to prevent the spread of the traffic by means of railways and improved means of communication. But, however limited, the reproach of a traffic whose consequences are without exception evil and destructive, rests still upon Christendom.

Many apologists for Islam in Africa have not failed to note this reproach of the liquor traffic upon Christendom, and to offset with it the stain of the slave trade upon Islam. The assumption that there is no drunkenness or use of intoxicating drink under Islam is a capital error, however. "No student of Moslem history and literature can have failed to see how dead a letter is the statute against the use of intoxicating drink," says a reviewer in the New York *Evening Post*. "The passages in the Koran supposed to forbid it are ambiguous, and the legal process is so arranged that a conviction is next to impossible. For example, the addition of water to wine makes it legal. Again it is certainly not European influence that has made the upper classes in Constantinople drink to excess. Their ancestors did so as far back as we can trace them, and the people is still to be found which has not used and abused intoxicants. In one respect the Turkish attitude is different from the European. The European professes some more or less innocent object for his drinking. The Turk settles down honestly to get drunk."[2]

---

[1] Brussels Conference, General Act, Ch. VI, Arts. XC–XCV.

[2] Review of Odysseus, *Turkey in Europe*, in New York *Evening Post*, April

Indeed the whole question of the comparative value and efficiency of Christianity and Mohammedanism as religions for the African has been openly raised and discussed even by Christian men. While not denying the superiority of a pure Christianity over a pure Mohammedanism, they have asserted that the actual results of Mohammedan evangelization in Africa have been superior to the results of Christian evangelization. Dr. Blyden contended that the Mohammedan negroes were more manly, had more self-respect, and higher views of the dignity of human nature; that Mohammedanism has established a real brotherhood, while Christianity has introduced the idea of caste, and has ignored racial idiosyncracies, and failed to adapt itself to in-

---

27, 1901. Cf. Dr. Dwight's testimony. ". . . In travelling in Turkey, I once fell in with a Pasha, governor of one of the provinces of Asia Minor. He was a most agreeable and even attractive man, and during a voyage which lasted several days, we talked on almost every conceivable subject of interest to plain and decent men.

"This sensible and well-meaning man showed me the corner-stone of his character one evening, at table in the cabin. He asked me to take a glass of wine with him. I declined. Then the Pasha said: 'You may think it strange that I, a Mohammedan, should ask you, a Christian, to drink with me when wine-drinking is forbidden by our religion. I will tell you how I dare to do this thing.' He filled his glass, and held it up, looking at the beautiful colour of it, and said: 'Now, if I say that it is right to drink this wine, I deny God's commands to men, and He would punish me in hell for the blasphemy. But I take up this glass, admitting that God has commanded me not to drink it, and that I sin in drinking it. Then I drink it off, so casting myself on the mercy of God. For our religion lets me know that God is too merciful to punish me for doing a thing which I wish to do, when I humbly admit that to do it breaks His commandments.'

"The Pasha's curious idea that God is too merciful to condemn failures in self-restraint throws a new light on the statement of religious teaching made by the Sheikh ul Islam.

"If we read it again, we shall see that it makes a clear distinction between commands of God which are duties obligatory upon every man, and requirements to which 'great attention must be paid.' The duties which the Sheikh ul Islam deems obligatory all belong to the formal observances of worship, while the requirements to which 'great attention' must be paid are all moral precepts. That these moral precepts are not essential parts of the religious demands of Islam is clear from the declaration that moral turpitude cannot deprive a man of his equality as a 'submitted one' (Moslem) nor of his share in the Moslem's paradise. The inverted importance thus given to observances of ritual compared with moral virtues affects the whole body of Mohammedan religious teaching. The Mohammedan believes in a materialistic sense the verse in Acts, 'They that call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.' The litany of Islam contains fourteen short ejaculations of praise, varied on great occasions by the addition of certain Glorias from the Koran. Few of them contain anything that a Christian may not say. But the order and number of repetitions of these pious ejaculations are of overmastering importance. A mistake in the order in which they are spoken, or in using while standing one which belongs to the bowing posture, or of making stitutions like polygamy which ought not to be roughly uprooted in a land like Africa. And in his paper, he quoted as a judgment which he apparently accepted as his own, the words of the ablest English apologist for Islam, Mr. Bosworth Smith: "That Mohammedanism may when mutual misunderstandings are removed, be elevated, chastened, purified by Christian influences and a Christian spirit, and that evils such as the slave trade which are really foreign to its nature, can be put down by the heroic efforts of Christian philanthropists, I do not doubt; and I can, therefore, look forward, if with something of anxiety, with still more of hope, to what seems the destiny of Africa, that paganism and devil-worship will die out, and that the main

four repetitions instead of three, spoils the whole worship, which has to be done over more carefully from the beginning. One of the Moslem traditions of Moses carries the idea of the importance and value of outward forms to its utmost limit: Moses, the man of God, one day prayed to God, saying, 'Oh, merciful God, show me the most wicked man in the city.' And God said to him: 'Stand by the gate and he that cometh in last at night is the most wicked man in the city.' So Moses stood by the gate and noted who was the last to come in, and the gates were shut. And Moses prayed again, saying, 'Oh, merciful God, show me, I pray Thee, the most holy man in the city.' So Moses stood at the gate in the morning, and when the gates were opened, behold, the first to go out was the same who was the last to come in at night and whom he had noted as the wickedest man; and lo! he was now the most holy. And Moses was troubled and he prayed again, saying, 'Oh, most merciful God, why has Thou dealt thus with Thy servant, saying of the same man that he is the most holy and the most wicked?' And the Lord answered: 'When that man came in he was unclean, but since he has performed his ablutions, so that none in the city is now so pure and holy as he.'

"The natural result of giving to ritual this unique position is to leave man free in his quest for self-gratification. Let it not be supposed that there is no recognition of sin in Islam. It is everywhere denounced. But it is everywhere regarded as wrong by the decree of God. God's decree can make vice virtue. Sin calls for retribution, not reform. Repentance is simply regret for the punishment of sin. Mohammed put his seal upon this materialistic view of repentance when one of his companions asked him what should be done with the body of a man stoned to death for adultery: 'Bury him,' said the Prophet, 'as a good Mussulman, for he has repented with such a repentance that if it were divided among the whole human race, it would suffice for all.' It fact, it seems to be thoroughly wrought into the intellect of the Mohammedan that character is an endowment of God which cannot be changed. The very idea of a change of character is omitted from the Koran. The Mohammedan sinner is taught that he is fit without reform of his fleshly tastes for admission to God's eternal favour. God's mercy may even spare him the pains of punishment. There is little in a doctrine of man's relation to God which can check the pursuit of self-gratification. But in the Mohammedan rules of life the importance of self and the interests of self are everywhere presupposed. Provision to spare the Moslem the pains of self-denial and self-control is found in the permission to pray but once a day, providing that tally is kept and the whole number of petitions due for the five times of prayer is carefully made up. It is found again in the arrangement of the rules for the great fast, so that men may recoup themselves for abstinence through the day by gorgpart of the continent, if it cannot become Christian, will become what is next best to it, Mohammedan."[1] The discussion of the question of the real superiority of Islam as a practicable religion for Africa, was made popular by a paper read by Canon Isaac Taylor, of the Church of England, at a Church Conference in 1888, in which he contrasted an ideal Islam with a defective Christianity, denounced the latter for its failures, and left the distinct suggestion that Islam as shown by its conquests in Africa and by reason of its essential character was the suitable religion for the continent. Canon Taylor's paper was answered by Mr. Bosworth Smith himself. After pointing out Canon Taylor's plagiarism, ignorance and inaccuracy, Mr. Smith went on, however, to contend that "Islam has introduced among many African tribes two great blessings which before they did not possess, namely, belief in one Almighty God, and noble and earnest moral teaching. It has also abolished cannibalism, human sacrifices and the burial of living infants. It has introduced suitable and decent clothing and personal cleanliness. It has caused tribes to coal-

---

ing themselves all night. It appears again in the rules for alms-giving and sacrifice as a part of worship when the man is definitely told that he need not give the best of his flock to God, but a medium animal, and when he is reminded in the Koran that sacrifice does not mean self-denial, since he has had the use of the beast before sacrifice and the use of it for food afterwards. The same tenderness for self-interest is shown in the categorical instruction of the Koran for men to take revenge for injuries, promising Divine aid where retaliation proves difficult. And the climax for such provisions for serving God without self-abnegation is reached in the carnal gratifications promised by the Koran as the reward of the faithful in Paradise, and repeatedly urged upon their study and meditation through life in order that any deprivation here may be felt to be but temporary. Islam has missed the appreciation of righteousness as an irreducible element. That self-seeking and self-indulgence attack fundamental laws of existence and separate a man from God and from his fellow-men is quite outside of its sphere of vision. Obedience to God requires from man words of the lips and deeds of outward observances only. This doctrine is the basis of that divorce between morals and religion everywhere noted among Moslems which makes the fact that man is engaged in prayer no guaranty as to the moral quality of that which he will do when he has finished his prayer.

"It needs no guide-post to show that the man who commits himself to such a doctrine of obedience will regard self-indulgence a privilege, a self-centred life an object of the benevolent solicitude of God, and religion a form. The Koran favours all these conclusions by several passages like its declaration when authorizing polygamy (in the Fourth Sura) 'God is minded to make your religion light unto you, for man was created weak.' It is not far hence to reach the belief that man has Divine permission to serve both God and Mammon" (*Report of Eighth Conference Foreign Missions Boards*, paper by the Rev. Henry O. Dwight, LL. D., "Mohammedan Questions in Missions," pp. 44–46).

[1] Smith, *Mohammed and Mohammedanism*, p. 40; Blyden, ***Christianity*, *Islam and the Negro Race***, Ch. I, "Mohammedanism and the Negro Race."

esce into nations, and nations into empires. Through its influence war is better organized, and is under some form of restraint. The Arabic language, a literature in itself, has become the lingua franca of the tribes of half the continent. It substitutes a written code of laws for the arbitrary caprice of the chieftain. Owing to its benign power, manufacture and commerce have sprung up, manufactures involving considerable skill, and a commerce elaborately organized. Great cities such as Segu, the capital of Bambarra, Buha (Kuka), the capital of Bornu, Kano, the Manchester of Negroland; and Ilorin of the Yoruba county—have thus come into existence, which for their peaceful industry and social organization have attracted the admiration of European travellers. Islam also absolutely prohibits the use of alcoholic liquors, and has 'established a total abstinence association in all the countries that own its sway.' Lastly wherever it has extended, it has almost entirely abolished the belief in sorcery and fetiches—excepting only in the comparatively harmless form of charm making, the charm being literally a bit of paper with mysterious Arabic characters written on it, which is worn or sometimes swallowed, as a preservative from sickness or any other misfortune."[1]

To this it is admitted by Mr. Smith that there are certain drawbacks—the slave trade, the contemptuous and anti-social feeling which the Negro Mohammedan is taught to entertain towards all non-Moslems, religious war and polygamy. "Polygamy is a gigantic evil," it is admitted, "corrupting society at the fountainhead. How can society be even tolerably pure when the family which is the source and school of all the gentler, all the more saintly, all the less self-regarding virtues is tainted?" It is to be said also that the spread of Islam to the extent claimed is not admitted by all, that its successes have been too often attained by characteristic Mohammedan methods, however much of pure evangelization there may have been,[2] and that not all travellers are able to speak of its civilization in the rosy terms employed by Mr. Bosworth Smith. "Dr. Schweinfurth testified that he never saw slaves so mercilessly treated as by the Mohammedan clergy whose life is 'in the most rigid sense a life of perpetual prayer.'" And he added, "The history of Islamism has been a history of crime." "I have myself," he testified, "seen whole tracts of country in Dar Ferteet turned into barren, uninhabited wilderness because all the young girls have been carried out of the country."[1] There is grave misapprehension as has been suggested regarding abstinence from drink and social purity in Moslem lands. No one acquainted with the facts can view complacently the drunkenness and immorality which have eaten into Mohammedan life in Persia and Turkey, and even more in Africa. Dr. Schweinfurth declared that many of the Mohammedan priests themselves conducted inns with grog-shops arranged as "temples of Venus."[2]

---

[1] Bosworth Smith, "Mohammedanism in Africa," *Nineteenth Century*, Dec. 1887. Summarized in *Church Missionary Intelligencer*, Feb. '88, p. 67.

[2] Atterbury, *Islam in Africa*, pp. 89f., 108f.

It may be admitted that Islam is an advance in many respects over the savage unordered life of many fetich worshipping tribes, and that its religious doctrine is infinitely in advance of their superstitions; but we have had within our own day a revelation of Mohammedanism in Northern Africa which will suffice to indicate whether Christians can with satisfied conscience leave the continent or the northern section of it to the domination of Islam. The Mahdi and the Khalifa were characteristic representations of the real nature of Moslem character and civilization.

The Mahdi movement[3] was not the first great Mohammedan movement in the Sudan. Early in the last century the spirit of the Puritanic reform of Wahabiism was brought from Mecca by a Fullah pilgrim, Othman don Fodio. On his return he had a vision of Mohammed, and was given a commission to rouse his people and drive out unbelievers. He preached reversion to the strictest Mohammedan practice, and roused his simple shepherd people to a fanaticism that transformed them into a nation of warriors. They swept over the whole central Sudan, slaying infidels, persecuting heresy, recalling apostates, and both spreading the faith and establishing their kingdom. On Othman's death the Empire he had built up was divided into two sections, and has survived into our day, having waged continual warfare through the century in the name of the Prophet, and holding all north central Africa in a terror that was a great encouragement to the profession of faith in Islam. The Senusi movement in Tripoli at a later day confirmed the evidence the Fullah outburst presented of the inflammableness and barbarity of that Sudanese Mohammedanism which has found its most violent expression in the sway of the Mahdi and his successor.

---

[1] Art. "A Rejoinder," *Church Missionary Intelligencer*, December, 1887.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 13.
[3] Sell, *The Faith of Islam*, Ch. III.

The Mahdi was a Mohammedan Dervish named Mohammed Ahmed, of the Dongolo race. He had long been known for his austerity, his eloquence, his personal power and his sanctity. He either thought or pretended to think that he had a divine call to summon the people to a reform and religious revival, and he travelled about denouncing the oppression of Egypt which held the Eastern Sudan, and preaching against the decadence of the true faith. He collected a small body of followers and soon had a collision with the Government at Khartum. His success drew to him the slave traders whose trade the work of Gordon and Gessi Pasha had broken up, and his reputed miracles and eloquence and affirmation of his divine mission drew the more ignorant and religious. He planned a revival of the slave trade, and he soon announced that he was in direct communication with God and that his commands were the will of God. The Mohammedan conception of the Mahdi[1] which has been considered in connection with Babism, prepared the way for Mohammed Ahmed, and his use of the conception reached the same end as Beha's. He came to be regarded himself almost as divine.[2] His purpose was to subdue the Sudan, conquer Egypt, then attack Mecca, "where the most bloody battle which the world had ever seen would take place; from Mecca he should proceed to Jerusalem, where Jesus Christ would descend from heaven."[3] His personality, his successes, and the fanaticism of the people whom he led, save the Mahdi almost uninterrupted success, and at last in 1885 he took Khartum and killed Gordon,[4] who had returned to the Sudan with the commission to withdraw the Egyptian garrisons and abandon the country to the Sudanese. The Mahdi, now untroubled from without, proceeded to solidify his kingdom. He had begun as a severe reformer, prohibiting the use of intoxicants and even tobacco, simplifying the marriage customs, and enjoining austerity of dress, forbidding all weeping for the dead, and all love of wealth, enjoining continual fasting, prayer and repentance, and declaring that as during his lifetime Jesus would appear and the whole world become Moslem, the one aim of life should be the holy war. Such teaching was sure to lead to such idleness and disorder as would produce famine and destruction.[1] When the Mahdi was settled in his rule he became more lax and worldly. Concubines and spoils enervated him and his warriors, and on June 22, 1885, he died of fatty degeneration of the heart, brought on, Father Ohrwalder, who was a prisoner with him, thinks, by his "debauched and dissolute mode of life."[2] "The shock of his death" says Father Ohrwalder, "was terrible. The wild fanatics were so to speak, struck dumb; their eyes were suddenly opened; and their very confusion showed that they had realized the Mahdi was a liar." The Khalifa Abdullah at once succeeded to the Mahdi's place before the anti-Mahdi party could move, and he continued the horrible rule of the Mahdists until in 1898 Kitchener crushed the movement and undid the harm done by the British Government thirteen years before, when it ran away from its great responsibilities. The Khalifa lacked the sterner simplicity of the Mahdi, and soon relaxed many of his Puritanic regulations, and only refrained from abandoning Mahdism altogether through fear that "a change of name might involve him in difficulties."[3] He called his palace, however, the "Bab," as the Sultan's government is called the "Porte." The Government became oppressively tyrannical. Famine devastated the land, even producing cannibalism.[4] The Khalifa introduced an intricate system of espionage. He required diligent atttendance at the mosques. He farmed out the taxes in the most approved style. He hunted down hostile tribes, and proposed the total stoppage of trade with Egypt, but in this was overruled. Bribery, corruption, brigandage and vice reigned in the capital. "Mohammed Ali conquered the Sudan," for Egypt, wrote Father Ohrwalder in 1892, while the Khalifa still ruled, "and in the train of his conquest followed all the triumphs of progress and civilization.[1] . . . The progress of fifty years was ruined by the Mahdi revolt. The Sudan fell back into the darkness from which philanthropy had rescued it. . . . Bands of fanatics have swept over the land destroying every Christian sign. The Sudan lies open in its desolation and nakedness. . . . Mahdism is founded on plunder and violence, and by plunder and violence it is carried on. In some districts half the people are dead, in others the loss of life is even greater. Whole tribes have been completely blotted out, and in their place roam the wild beasts, spreading and increasing in numbers until they bid fair to finish the destruction of the human race."[2] And this was the great Mohammedan power which fell when Gordon was avenged and a great reproach removed on September 4, 1898.

---

[1] When Napoleon was in Egypt in 1798, he took advantage of the Mohammedan expectation of the Mahdi to help his cause. Not content with protecting the religious observances of Islam, having some of his officers embrace it, and inscribing sentences from the Koran on a French tricolour, on Dec. 21, 1798, a proclamation was addressed to the people of Cairo, in which with a "strong suspicion of Messianic language," Bonaparte claimed divine inspiration, and the language is such as to suggest that Bonaparte might be the Vicar to the Mahdi or even the Mahdi himself (Dennis, *Eastern Question at the Close of the Eighteenth Century* pp. 188ff.).

[2] Wingate, *Ten Years' Captivity in the Mahdi Camp*, p. 180.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 123.

[4] Newfeld, *A Prisoner of the Khalifa*, Ch. XXV.

---

[1] Wingate, *Ten Years' Captivity in the Mahdi's Camp*, pp. 22f.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 184.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 297.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 308f.

There are three things only of which I would speak in connection with the missionary aspects of the Mahdi rising. (1) This was a clear and authoritative illustration of Moslem rule, such as the apologists think is superior for the Africans to the Christian religion. It is futile to say that this is not the sort of Mohammedanism they mean. This is the orthodox type. It was a return to the older faith, born of the Wahabi denunciation of the compromise and degeneracy of modern Islam. It is idle also to say that the apologists mean to commend Islam only as religion, not as government. Islam as religion and not government is not Islam. Mahdism, like the madness and bloody cruelty of the Fullahs, is the truest representation of real Mohammedanism the last century produced. Who prefers it to Christianity, even to the type that prevails in South America?

---

[1] Mr. Morley sets forth a different view of the character of Egyptian influence in the Sudan: "The misrule of the Sudan by Egypt had been atrocious, and the combination of a religious revival with the destruction of that hated yoke swelled a cry that was irresistible. The rising rapidly extended, for fanaticism in such regions soon takes fire, and the Egyptian pashas had been sore oppressors, even judged by the rude standards of oriental states. Never was insurrection more amply justified. From the first, Mr. Gladstone's curious instinct for liberty disclosed to him that here was a case of 'a people rightly struggling to be free.' The phrase was mocked and derided then and down to the end of the chapter. Yet it was the simple truth. 'During all my political life,' he said at a later stage of Sudanese affairs, 'I am thankful to say that I never opened my lips in favour of a domination such as that which has been exercised upon certain other countries, and I am not going now to begin.' 'I look upon the possession of the Sudan,' he proceeded, 'as the calamity of Egypt. It has been a drain on her treasury, it has been a drain on her men. It is estimated that 100,000 Egyptians have laid down their lives in endeavouring to maintain that barren conquest.' Still stronger was the Sudanese side of the case. The rule of the Mahdi was itself a tyranny, and tribe fought with tribe, but that was deemed an easier yoke than the sway of the pashas from Cairo. Every vice of eastern rule flourished freely under Egyptian hands. At Khartum whole families of Coptic clerks kept the accounts of plundering raids supported by Egyptian soldiers, and 'this was a Government collecting its taxes.' The function of the Egyptian soldiers 'was that of honest countrymen sharing in the villainy of the brigands from the Levant and Asia Minor, who wrung money, women, and drink from a miserable population'" (Morley, *Life of Gladstone*, Vol. II, pp. 144f.). Father Ohrwalder's testimony was edited by Wingate whom Mr. Morley describes as "the English officer who knows the Sudan best" (*Ibid.*, Vol. II., p. 157), and it is the testimony of an eye-witness. Either he is not a reliable witness or Mr. Morley's statement needs to be qualified.

[2] Wingate, *Ten Years' Captivity in the Mahdi's Camp*, pp. 456–458.

(2) The death of Gordon, the horrors of the Khalifa's rule and the costly recovery of the ground that was thrown away in 1884–85, illustrate the missionary duty of Government which it cannot reject save at great peril and cost. History is likely to judge Mr. Gladstone's foreign policy in this matter more severely even than it was judged in his own day. It was his Government which withdrew the military consuls from Asiatic Turkey, and so unwittingly gave public notice that Great Britain did not intend to fulfill the obligations she had assumed in 1878 and that the Armenian Christians were fair prey. Again it was his Government which surrendered the Sudan, and thus played into the Mahdi's hands at a time when it was England's duty to crush the wild movement which was to sweep the whole Eastern Sudan with desolation and misery.[1] It was his Gov-

---

[1] Mr. Morley puts the case in Mr. Gladstone's behalf as strongly as it can be put in a few words: "The unparalleled difficulties that ultimately attended the evacuation of the Sudan naturally led inconsiderate critics,—and such must ever be in the majority,—to condemn the policy and the cabinet who ordered it. So apt are men in their rough judgments on great disputable things, to mistake a mere impression for a real opinion; and we must patiently admit that the result —success or failure in the event—is the most that they have time for, and all that they can go by. Yet two remarks are to be made upon this facile censure. The first is that those who knew the Sudan best, approved most. On January 22, 1884, Gordon wrote to Lord Granville that the Sudan ever was and ever would be a useless possession, and that he thought the Queen's ministers 'fully justified in recommending evacuation, inasmuch as the sacrifices necessary towards securing good government would be far too onerous to admit of such an attempt being made.' Colonel Stewart quite agreed, and added the exclamation that nobody who had ever visited the Sudan could escape the reflection, 'What a useless possession and what a huge encumbrance on Egypt!' As we shall see, the time soon came when Gordon accepted the policy of evacuation, even with an emphasis of his own. The second remark is that the reconquest of the Sudan and the

ernment also which proposed to abandon Uganda and whose contemplation of such a course called forth Bishop Tucker's strong indictment: "Let me not be misunderstood. I deprecate in the very strongest terms the idea that missionaries in penetrating into savage and uncivilized countries should look for or expect aid from their home Governments. No proposition could be more preposterous, no contention more absurd. But if the missionaries have no right (and clearly they have none) to compromise the home Government, on the other hand the home Government, I maintain, has no right to compromise the missionaries. And this, I submit, Her Majesty's Government has done with respect to Uganda. . . . To tear up the treaties that have been signed after having thus compromised the English missionaries and their adherents, and on the faith of which the latter were led to cast in their lot with the English Company; to break pledges given in the most solemn manner; to repudiate obligations entered into with deliberation and aforethought; and then to disclaim all responsibility for the consequences that must inevitably ensue, would be to my mind to adopt a course of action that I dare not at the present moment trust myself to characterize, and one that I cannot believe would ever be sanctioned by any Government of Her Majesty the Queen."[1] I cannot state more strongly a great principle of political morality, or bring out more clearly the duty of a state in relation to certain problems which arise in missions, or to

holding of Khartum were for the Egyptian Government, if left to its own resources, neither more nor less than impossible; these objects, whether they were good objects or bad, not only meant recourse to British troops for the first immense operations, but the retention of them in a huge and most inhospitable region for an indefinite time. A third consideration will certainly not be overlooked by anybody who thinks on the course of the years of Egyptian reform that have since elapsed, and constitute so remarkable a chapter of British administration,—namely, that this beneficent achievement would have been fatally clogged, if those who conducted it had also had the Sudan on their hands. The renovation or reconstruction of what is called Egypt proper, its finances, its army, its civil rule, would have been absolutely out of reach, if at the same time its guiding statesmen had been charged with the responsibilities of recovering and holding that vaster tract which had been so rashly acquired and so mercilessly misgoverned. This is fully admitted by those who have had most to do with the result" (Morley, *The Life of Gladstone*, Vol. III, pp. 147f.). But if England was warranted in taking Egypt for the sake of the Suez Canal which was a useful thing was she warranted in lightly throwing over the Sudan because it was "useless"? Are "the sacrifices necessary to securing good government" only to be made when the acquisition has rich gold mines on it or is otherwise "useful"?

[1] Stock, *History of the Church Missionary Society*, Vol. III, pp. 445f.

certain political conditions of a truly missionary nature which come inevitably in the history of every nation. It is strange that a purpose of magnanimity and fairness in his foreign policy led Mr. Gladstone, one of the best and most just men of his century, to courses of action which resulted in indescribable misery and the needless and pitiful sufferings of untold multitudes.[1]

(3) It is worth while to note the attitude taken by Lord Cromer and General Kitchener with reference to the presence of missionaries in the Sudan. After the battle of Omdurman, Kitchener refused to allow any missionaries to come to Khartum unless they agreed to refrain absolutely from any missionary work among Mohammedans. When the Khalifa died and the conquest of the Egyptian Sudan seemed to be complete, the missionaries were permitted to come, but still the prohibition of work of any kind among Moslems remained, and even now has not been withdrawn, and the missionaries are waiting tongue-tied by order of the Government. The policy of Egypt in connection with which the Eastern Sudan will be administered, has reverted so far as the Mohammedans are concerned to that of the East India Company before the Mutiny, a policy of distinct discouragement to evangelizing missions, the policy that urges in the case of Egypt, "that if the Egyptians were to see any reason to believe that Lord Cromer himself consciously desires or wills their conversion to the Christian faith, this would be 'fatal to the success of Lord Cromer's policy,' a policy in which it is admitted that Lord Cromer has shown a scrupulous, possibly an over-scrupulous respect for Mohammedan feelings and prejudices."[2] Compare with this Chinese

---

[1] See Macaulay, *Gordon Anecdotes*, pp. 130ff.

[2] *Church Missionary Intelligencer*, July, 1901, pp. 509f. Art. by Arnold Ward in *Nineteenth Century*, Aug., 1900. Lord Cromer's report, 1903, shows his favourable attitude towards work for pagan tribes as distinguished from the Mohammedans. "An opportunity was afforded to me, during my recent tour in the Sudan, of visiting the station established by the American missionaries on the Sobat River. The establishment consists of Mr. and Mrs. Giffen and Dr. and Mrs. McLaughlin. I was greatly pleased with all I saw. The mission is manifestly conducted on those sound, practical, common-sense principles which, indeed, are strongly characteristic of American mission work in Egypt. No parade is made of religion. In fact, the work of conversion, properly so-called, can scarcely be said to have commenced. Mr. Giffen has, very wisely, considered that, as a preliminary to the introduction of Christian teaching, his best plan will be to gain some insight into the ideas, manners, and customs of the wild Shilluks amongst whom he lives, to establish in their minds thorough confidence in his intentions, and to inculcate some rudimentary knowledge of the

Gordon's attitude. "There is not the least doubt," he writes to his sister from Massowah, in 1878, "that there is an immense virgin field for an apostle in these countries among the black tribes. . . . If any society wants a field in which there are virgin people of quiet disposition who will receive the missionaries well, there is such a field in these countries and I would do my best to help them. . . .

Christian moral code. In these endeavours he appears to have been eminently successful. By kindly and considerate treatment he is allaying those suspicions which are so easily aroused in the minds of savages. I found considerable numbers of Shilluks, men and women, working happily at the brick-kiln which he has established in the extensive and well cultivated garden attached to the mission. I may remark incidentally that cotton, apparently of good quality, has already been produced. The houses in which the members of the mission live have been constructed by Shilluk labour. I addressed the men present, through an interpreter, and fully satisfied myself that they were happy and contented. They understand that they can now no longer be carried off into slavery, that they will be treated with justice and consideration, and paid for their labour.

"Not only can there be no possible objection to mission work of this description, but I may add that, from whatever point of view the matter is considered, the creation of establishments conducted on the principles adopted by Mr. Giffen and Dr. McLaughlin cannot fail to prove an unmixed benefit to the population amongst whom they live. I understand that the American missionaries contemplate the creation of another mission post higher up the Sobat. It is greatly to be hoped that they will carry out this intention. They may rely on any reasonable encouragement and assistance which it is in the power of the Sudan Government to afford. It is, I venture to think, to be regretted that none of the British missionary societies appear so far to have devoted their attention to the southern portions of the Sudan, which are inhabited by pagans. Not only do these districts present a far more promising field for missionary enterprise than those provinces whose population is Mohammedan, but the manifest political objections which exist in allowing mission work in the latter, do not in any degree exist in the former case. I entirely agree with the opinion held by Sir Reginald Wingate, and shared, I believe, by every responsible official who can speak with local knowledge and authority on the subject, that the time is still distant when mission work can, with safety and advantage, be permitted amongst the Moslem population of the Sudan.

"Subsequently to writing these remarks I visited the Austrian Roman Catholic Mission, situated a short distance south of Fashoda. It is also very well conducted, and deserves the same amount of encouragement as that accorded to the American establishment.

"I should add that, although mission work, properly so-called, cannot as yet be permitted amongst the Moslem population of the Sudan, I see no objection to the establishment of Christian Schools at Khartum. Parents should, of course be warned, before they send their children to the schools, that instruction in the Christian religion is afforded. It will then be for them to judge whether they wish their children to attend or not. Probably the best course to pursue will be to set aside certain hours for religious instruction, and leave it optional to the parents whether or not their children shall attend during those hours. It must be remembered that besides the Moslem population, there is a small number of Christians at Khartum. These might very probably wish to take advantage of the schools" (Extract from Lord Cromer's report, 1903, quoted in *The Christian Express*, September 1, 1903).

To tell you plainly, I think the price God asks of a man who comes out to live among the tribes is too great for a man to pay. You may rely on my doing what I could to help any who come out."[1] It may be said that Gordon is speaking not of Moslem tribes, but of pagans, and that Kitchener was quite ready to facilitate the passage of missionaries beyond Khartum to the heathen tribes. That is true, and it is barely conceivable that Gordon might have acted as Kitchener did, but nothing in his attitude ever indicated that he would, and his own fearless religious life never hid itself or scrupled at what inference might be drawn from it. And in the Punjab, British officials had openly worked to establish missions far and wide even in Peshawar in 1853, a situation vastly more perilous than Khartum in 1901. When it was objected that a mission would surely create trouble, Herbert Edwardes replied, "I say plainly that I have no fear that the establishment of a Christian mission at Peshawar will tend to disturb the peace. It is of course incumbent upon us to be prudent; to lay stress upon the selection of discreet men for missionaries; to begin quietly with schools and wait the proper time for preaching. But having done that, I should fear nothing. In this crowded city we may hear the Brahman in his temple sound his 'shunkh' and gong, the muezzin on his lofty minaret fill the air with the 'azan,' and the civil Government which protects them both will take upon itself the duty of protecting the Christian missionary who goes forth to preach the Gospel. Above all, we may be quite sure that we are much safer if we do our duty than if we neglect it, and that He who has brought us here, with His own right arm, will shield and bless us, if, in simple reliance upon Him, we try to do His will."[2]

As we have witnessed thus the dissolution of a great Moslem Power in the north of Africa, we witnessed shortly after also the disappearance of two Christian States in the south. It is not the purpose of these chapters to discuss difficulties between Christian States. The inevitableness of this particular conflict will be apparent to any one who will read over the history of South Africa, study the development of its politics, and then look at an old map and notice the Transvaal and the Orange Free State once existing as islands in a sea of almost surrounding British territory. Good men have formed different opinions of the Boers. "I like the Boers; they are a God-fearing people," writes Gordon in 1882.[1] On the other hand, David Livingstone writes to Mr. Watt in 1853, of two papers which he had with him which he had written, "One is on the South African Boers and slavery, in which I show that their Church is and always has been the great bulwark of slavery, cattle lifting and Kaffir-marauding; and I correct the mistaken views of some writers who describe the Boers as all that is good; and of others who describe them as all that is bad; by showing who are the good and who are the bad."[2] The simple question that concerns us is the relation of the Boer question to missions. There can be no doubt that the attitude of the Boers to missionary work has never until recently been very favourable, and that even now in spite of the influence of the Church there are fewer missions among the people of the Transvaal and Free State than in the Cape Colony and Natal and British South Africa.[3] The Boers gave Livingstone great trouble, and were angered at his denunciation of their participation in the evils of slavery and their maltreatment of the natives, and they objected to the doctrine of the negro's equality with the white man inculcated by the British missionaries;[4] and to the interference of the missionaries for the protection of the native people, contending that the missionaries "used to bring groundless or exaggerated charges against the Boer farmers, and always sided with the natives whatever the merits of the case."[5] It is undoubtedly true that the attitude of the British has been fairer and more just and kindly to the native races than the attitude of the Boers, and that the incorporation of the Boer Republics in the British territory apart from the political convenience thereof, will improve the conditions of the natives, and both on that account and because of the increased sense of responsibility for the natives it will give the British people, will be of a real advantage to the mission cause. While the war was still dragging along, Dr. Stewart, of Lovedale, one of the foremost missionaries in Africa gave expression to such a hopeful view of the outcome. Writing to *Missions of the World*, he said:

---

[1] *Letters of General Gordon to His Sister*, pp. 130–132.

[2] *Church Missionary Intelligencer*, July, 1901, p. 505.

---

[1] *Letters of General Gordon to His Sister*, p. 199.

[2] Blaikie, *Personal Life of David Livingstone*, p. 128.

[3] Bryce, *Impressions of South Africa*, p. 387.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 388.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 391.

"It is difficult to say what has been the exact amount of mischief done to mission stations in South Africa by the present war. Details are not yet forthcoming, and some time must elapse before these losses can be reckoned up.

"In all the districts, however, that have lain in the area of military operations, missionary work for the time being has been more or less disorganized. This is only what might have been expected. In many cases in the north of Natal and certain portions of the Transvaal the missionary has had to leave. In some instances he became chaplain to the British forces, in others he had to retire to the Cape Colony.

"No section of the population of South Africa will derive more benefit from the success of the British arms than the natives. At least 4,000,000 of natives will be influenced by the results of this struggle. That may be taken as the number that will come under British rule, and is exclusive of the population of Portuguese East Africa, and the sparsely-populated district of German Southwest Africa, and it includes the Cape Colony and Natal as well as Rhodesia. Had the result of the war been different from what it is, and the object aimed at—the overthrow of British supremacy—been secured, the prospect for the natives would have been dark indeed.[1] Their civil rights, as a matter of course, would have

---

[1] The virtue is not all on one side, however, in this matter of the treatment of the native races. There was Christian opinion among the Boers and there is savage opinion among the British. Witness the facts in the following editorial article in the *British Weekly*, December 5, 1901, entitled, "Rhodesia and the Natives":

"We have already and more than once called attention to the immense seriousness of the native problem in South Africa. One great reason of the support given by Christian people in this country to the war is the manner in which the Boers treated the natives. Stress was laid on this by Mr. E. T. Cook in his very able work on the war. In criticising the book Sir Charles Dilke remarked that the Boer view of the native was the view taken by the great majority of our own colonists in South Africa. If this be so, the natives would be precisely in the same position after the war as before it. Correspondents of ours who are well entitled to speak support Sir Charles Dilke. They tell us that white sentiment in Rhodesia is to a great extent in favour of forced labour, and of treating the Kaffir very much as a beast of burden. We reprint a most significant article from the Rhodesia *Herald*, published at Salisbury, October 24th, 1901. The reference is to the supply of native labour for the mines by native commissioners. These commissioners are supposed to look after the interest of the natives, to see that they are not oppressed by white employers, to adjudicate in petty disputes, and to collect the Hut Tax. One of their chief duties, however, has been to collect labour for the mines. Instructions were sent from headquarters to a native commissioner that a certain number of 'boys' were required at such and such a mine in his district. The commissioner sent out native policemen to the various kraals with orders to bring so many 'boys' from each kraal. If the 'boys' had not succeeded in hiding themselves they were taken possession of whether they liked it or not. This is a case of forced labour, pure and simple. This kind of thing is done very quietly, and as secretly as possible, but we are assured that these are the facts. The article which we reproduce speaks for itself, and we entreat every reader to peruse it very carefully. The italics are our own.

"'Influences seem at work undermining the status of the colonist in this and been entirely disregarded; and as a people they would have been reduced to the condition in which they have always lived under Boer rule. It may not receive the name of slavery now, but to all intents and purposes, excepting, perhaps, that of public sale, their condition would have been exactly similar.

"The struggle is not yet over but it is nearly so, and out of the reconstructed South Africa there will arise a much greater freedom for missionary operations

the other countries of South Africa. Exeter Hall—that monument of modern humbug—seems to be gaining some secret hold on the Imperial Government. Conditions in Chartered territory have already been seriously modified. Native Commissioners will not be allowed to procure labour. Their duties, always somewhat obscure, now become narrowed down to a purely hypothetical scope. The Administration is bound hand and foot. Limited as were its powers at any time during the life of the Charter, it now becomes, so far as the native is concerned, a mere cypher. Henceforth the Government of the Mashona and Matabele may be understood to mean their special protection and preservation on approved Exeter Hall lines. How the Aborigine Protectionist has risen to such strength in England is matter of conjecture. Yet it seems to be quite reasonable to assume that the Colonial Office has been coerced into making terms with this faction to gain party support. For weeks past the columns of the great Ministerial papers have been open to the abuse of the Boer treatment of the native. No revilings have been too bad, so long as they pointed the moral of Dutch iniquity. We are now paying for these excesses. If the old Transvaal and Free State were brutal to blacks, we must be kind in contrast. If, however, they were no more than wise and just, our contrast is likely to be something foolish. That is the present predicament.

"'The ignorant mob that persists in venerating an ideal of the Kaffir races is set to ride colonists to their destruction. The alternative is for the latter to refuse to play the patient ass. Being made of "sterner stuff," the majority of South Africans will decline to be guided by theorists and canting visionaries. Blacks, as several hundred years' experience has demonstrated, are the inferiors of whites, and as such they will be ultimately treated here as elsewhere between the Zambesi and the Cape. *We regret that men should be hanged anywhere for shooting natives, whether in cold blood or hot.* There will rarely be shooting without extenuating circumstances, and, striking an average, we are bold enough to maintain that *the Mosaic exchange of a life for a life is a one-sided affair where white pays for black.* The principle involved is not one to be reached by the abstract speculator. Those who live alongside the native know; those who have only seen show specimens at a circus, or at missionary fund-raising meetings, do not know. Common-sense elects the former as the rightful legislators; the irony of central Government the latter. While a difference of opinion in another matter is being fought out, Rhodesia is importing workers, having no other resort; but as this process does not solve the problem, it must recur with increased virulence at one time or another. *Prunella oppression and Kaffir indolence and insult will goad the settler to action, and in his effort to be free he can hardly be trusted to select the most gentle way*, if, indeed, he will be in the mood to consult any but his own feelings. If prunella is tolerated in Downing Street there is mischief brewing.'

"In another article published in the same paper on October 8th, the editor says: 'However the Boers treated the blacks, Britain is not fighting them on that point. Far from it. We should all hail with delight a recognition of the true relationship between natives and colonists, such as the Raad laws were based upon. Doubtless after Lord Milner has been in residence in the Transvaal for some months the tenour of Home opinion will begin to undergo some of all kinds. Missions are more or less influenced by political conditions and developments, even though they have no direct connection therewith. In such freedom missionary work thrives as in a more genial atmosphere; and out of all this turmoil there will arise a better state of things.

" In the matter of native education this will be especially felt. Under the Boer Republics such education was a thing not dreamt of. No assistance from Government was given, with the exception of one trifling grant in the Orange Free State. The native, however, like the Uitlander, had to contribute heavily for

modification. His Excellency the High Commissioner has a free and unbiassed mind, and we have every reason for believing that in the natural course of events he will begin to see native affairs eye to eye with the Colonial. Then the aboriginist and his society must go the way of all misbegotten institutions—institutions founded on disordered and sentimental imagination.' One correspondent writes to us: 'A colleague of mine returning from the Zambesi a week or two ago met a number of " boys " on their way home from a certain mine. They were carrying a " brother " who had been seriously injured in a dynamite explosion. Asked what the white men had done to help him after the accident, he said, " Nothing." No medicine had been given him, no monetary compensation, and not even a few tins of beef for the road!' The Christian Church in every section must be prepared to fight the battle of the native. We look to the Christian ministers in South Africa to take a prominent part in the strife. There is no fear as to the issue. No Government could seriously propose to restore slavery. The Salisbury editor, with his brother the Bulawayo editor, may make up their minds that Great Britain will stand firm upon this point. We are not fighting this war in order that the Boer way of treating the blacks may be sanctioned and perpetuated by this country. Lord Milner will disappoint the hopes of the Rhodesians. If he satisfied them he would be recalled in a week. We have furnished material which ought to be steadily kept in mind, and the time has perhaps come when public bodies in passing resolutions should not neglect this, the greatest and gravest of all the great and grave problems which abound in South Africa."

The following paragraphs from the Minutes of the Livingstonia Mission Council, held in May, 1903, furnish another illustration:

" The Secretary read communications from the Blantyre Mission Council regarding the recruiting of labour in British Central Africa for the Johannesburg mines, and inviting the cooperation of the Livingstonia Mission Council in the matter. The Rev. J. Henderson proposed, and Rev. A. Dewar seconded, the following motion, which was unanimously agreed to by the Mission Council:—

" 'That the Mission Council view with apprehension the moral results which will follow from recruiting labour in the British Central African Protectorate for the Johannesburg mines. They strongly protest against the Administration acting as a recruiting agency. Already a feeling of alarm has been created in the West Nyassa district, where the Collector, to whom alone the native can look for protection against coercion or injustice, is calling for labour through his messengers, in the case of whom the natives may not distinguish a request from a command.' "

As from the beginning it is the missionary who appears as the defender of the native races. For the first half of the last century, and indeed with too few exceptions like Sir George Grey and Sir Bartle Frere since, the natives, says Dr. Stewart, had " no other advocates than the missionaries. It was by them, not by colonists nor primarily by legislators, that the battle was fought, though they were supported by a small number of humane and just-minded colonists as well " (Stewart, *Dawn in the Dark Continent*, p. 99).

> the benefit of Dutch children. For himself he got nothing. With this new freedom the natives will progress more rapidly, and the Christianized sections are all anxious to advance. They will thus be more able to support their own ministers, and work gradually towards becoming a self-supporting Church. This reconstruction, however, will take time." [1]

To the extent, that the war has left irritation and more embittered racial feeling behind it, it will surely, for a time, hinder Christian work. May it not be hoped, however, that the annexation having taken place, and causes for disaffection having become thus historic rather than present and acutely pressing, a spirit of toleration and ultimately of good feeling will grow up, that will make South Africa as harmonious and ultimately as Christian as Canada?

We should not have considered adequately the question of our missionary responsibilities towards Africa if we did not turn for a moment to Liberia and the relation to Africa and its evangelization of the negro race in America. The Liberian Republic grew out of the Colonization movement. In 1820 the first settlement of freed negroes was made at Cape Mesurado, and in 1847 Liberia was recognized as an independent State. It has grown territorially since by absorbing the negro settlement of Maryland and by advancing into the interior from its coast possessions; but it is now shut out from other advance by the French occupation of the Sudan. North and south on the coast, or rather west and east, the Republic has for its neighbours, Great Britain in Sierra Leone, and France on the Ivory Coast. At the time of its founding, and for years afterwards there was a large body of public opinion that saw in the colonization of the American negro in Africa the solution of the negro problem in America, and also the brightest hope of the civilization and Christianization of Africa. "It would seem," said Daniel Webster before the American Colonization Society, referring to the Providential significance of the transportation of the African to American slavery, and his return now to Africa as a colonist, "that this is the mode—as far as we can judge—this is the destiny, the rule of things, established by Providence, by which knowledge, letters and Christianity shall be returned by the descendants of these poor ignorant barbarians, who were brought here as slaves, to the country from which they came." And Edward Everett, before the Society the following year declared, "I believe the auspicious work is begun; that Africa will be civilized—civilized by her offspring and descendants. I believe it because I will not think that this mighty and fertile region is to remain barren in its present state; because I can see no other agency adequate to the accomplishment of the work, and I do behold in this agency a most mysterious fitness."[1] These were very natural views, but history has shown that at the best they are still but hopeful dreams.

---

[1] Quoted in *The Christian Express*, March 1, 1901.

In the first place the negro does not propose to go to Africa. He is acclimatized here. His traditions are American. He knows his conditions here, and even though colonization enthusiasts describe glowingly the future that awaits him in Africa, he prefers to be content with what he has, and is sure of. Even if he were willing to go, the South would protest against being denuded of its labour, and would antagonize the appropriation of Government funds for the purpose. Private philanthropy could not bear the burden of the gigantic expense, and the negro could not pay his way if he wished to go. The proposal that any large number of negroes should leave the United States and return to Africa is chimerical. Colonization on a small scale, has not entirely ceased, but the scale is insignificant and the number of colonists to Liberia has decreased greatly. The whole movement has practically collapsed.

In the second place, it took too much for granted. The American negro in Africa has probably stood the climatic conditions better than the American white man; but some deny this, and the difference in his favour is not great enough to counterbalance the disadvantages. He does not have the persistence, the initiative, the aggressiveness, the tenacity of purpose and of standard of character which the white man possesses. There have been splendid exceptions, but even in the case of Bishop Crowther, it was confessed at the end that his easy going judgments and want of a steady vision or will to maintain certain standards, had allowed the work on the Niger to fall into real evils and abuses. Africa is to be evangelized by Africans undoubtedly, just as China is to be evangelized by the Chinese; and as the Chinese who are to evangelize China are in China and will be educated for their work in China, so the Africans who are to evangelize Africa are in Africa, and will be trained for their mission

[1] Quoted in Blyden, *Christianity, Islam and the Negro Race*, pp. 406f.

there. Doubtless the American negro will take a larger share in the work than he has thus far done, but as a factor in the missionary problem in Africa, he is of little value, until the day comes, which is surely coming, when he shall have attained a degree of tenacity and solidity of character not yet attained, and by the exercise of powerful and vitalizing influence in America have shown that he has the resources and capacities to stand the strain and drain of communicating Christianity and civilization to a continent of needy souls in Africa.

The history of Liberia confirms the truth of these statements. So far as enlargement through American colonization is concerned, it has practically stood still for years, and so far as showing what the American negro can do in Africa, it has not been a great encouragement. The Government, it is to be feared, is no better now than it was fifty years ago, if indeed, it is as good. Commodore Perry wrote of it when he visited Liberia half a century ago, "I cannot but believe that the colony of Liberia is firmly and permanently established, and that it possesses at this early period of its existence the germs of a powerful empire, to be populated by a class of people hitherto unknown, at least to modern times—a community of blacks destined to enjoy all the advantages of civilization and to exercise its full share of political influence in the family of nations." On the contrary, to-day Liberia is barely able to maintain itself. It exerts no influence in the world, and in the evangelization of Africa is accomplishing almost nothing. Its own churches are feeble in vital work, and are doing little to reach the interior tribes within Liberian territory.[1] On the other hand Liberia has, however precariously, maintained itself, and proved that the American negro is capable of self-government and of self-maintenance in Africa. His State is a better State than the Sultan of Muscat's, than Korea, than some African colonies under European control or than some European Asiatic colonies. Liberia is a fair reply to all who deny the negro's capacity to rule himself. But it is also a fair reply to those who advocate colonization as the hope of the negro race in America, or of the evangelization of the African Continent.

---

[1] Blyden, *Christianity, Islam and the Negro Race*, pp. 108–129, 217–276, 383–423; *Church Missionary Intelligencer*, November, 1887, pp. 662f.; *West Africa*, August 3, 1901, pp. 919–926.

But it may be asked, "If the Negro cannot be expected to evangelize Africa is there any hope that white men can do it?" White men will have to do it just as white men will have to evangelize Asia and South America. They must organize the work, keep up its morale, its definiteness of purpose, its aims, and pour into it a tide of unresting energy and unhesitating sacrifice. And of sacrifice there will be in central and tropical Africa continual need. Sir Lambert Playfair once wrote from Algeria, "An English labourer working there in summer would be dead in a week. As a rule you may safely say that natives of northern Europe cannot support the climate of north Africa as actual labourers, and only moderately well as employers of labour."[1] And what is true of north Africa is even more true of central Africa. But the difficulties of life in Africa are sure to decrease with railroads, better precautions against fever and disease, more healthful routes and stations, and a fuller understanding of the conditions of life. And for the sake of the material wealth and resources of the continent, or even for the mere sake of maintaining a barren sovereignty, white men will continue to live and die in Africa. Missionaries will not shrink from perils which merchants and officials cheerfully accept, which are part of the campaign. As Krapf wrote in one of his last letters to England, "Real missionaries and their friends must never be discouraged at whatever appearance things may assume from without. They must act as a wise general does. When he is beaten back on one point, he attacks the enemy on another point, according to the plan he has previously laid out. And in all cases true missionaries and their friends must be mindful of the memorable words which were spoken by the French Guard at the Battle of Waterloo, 'La garde ne se rend pas, elle meurt'—'The Guard does not surrender, it dies.'"[2]

---

[1] Keltie, *Partition of Africa*, pp. 440f.

[2] Stock, *History of Church Missionary Society*, Vol. III, p. 112.

The Reform Movement in Hinduism

VI

THE REFORM MOVEMENT IN HINDUISM

"THE great majority of the population of India," said Macaulay in his speech on the Gates of Somnauth, "consists of idolaters, blindly attached to doctrines and rites, which considered merely with reference to the temporal interests of mankind, are in the highest degree pernicious. In no part of the world has a religion ever existed more unfavourable to the moral and intellectual health of our race. The Brahmanical mythology is so absurd that it necessarily debases every mind which receives it as truth; and with this absurd mythology is bound up an absurd system of physics, an absurd geography, an absurd astronomy. Nor is this form of paganism more favourable to art than to science. Through the whole Hindu pantheon you will look in vain for anything resembling those beautiful and majestic forms which stood in the shrines of ancient Greece. All is hideous and grotesque and ignoble. As this superstition is of all superstitions the most irrational, and of all superstitions the most inelegant, so it is of all superstitions the most immoral. Emblems of vice are objects of public worship. Acts of vice are acts of public worship. The courtesans are as much a part of the establishment of the temple, as much the ministers of the gods as the priests. Crimes against life, crimes against property are not only permitted but enjoined by this odious theology. But for our interference human victims would still be offered to the Ganges, and the widow would still be laid on the pile with the corpse of her husband, and buried alive by her own children. It is at the command and under the special protection of one of the most powerful goddesses that the thugs join themselves to the unsuspecting traveller, make friends with him, slip the noose round his neck, plunge their knives into his eyes, hide him in the earth and divide his money and baggage."

Powerful as this indictment is, it is a partial and temperate statement. To make it even measurably complete there would have to be added a great weight of further condemnation. Apart from the evils of infanticide, suttee and thuggee, all now abolished by the British Government against the opposition of Hinduism, there are the evils of child marriage, the pitiable lot of widows, temple prostitution, the iron slavery of caste, the gross idolatries of polytheism, and the grosser moral consequences of a pantheistic belief which obliterates the line of distinction between sin and righteousness and covers the foulest practices with the cloak of religion.[1] That is the worst feature of it all. The evils of India are not social vices forbidden by its religions and flourishing in spite of them. They are sanctioned by its religion, rooted in it so deep that all efforts of the British Government to overthrow these evils have been resisted as attacks on the religion which sanctions them and of which they are regarded as necessary rites or expressions. The introduction of the Christian idea of holiness would be utterly destructive of Hinduism in its popular and orthodox form. Its proclamation of ineradicable distinction between vice and virtue would of itself be sufficient to destroy the Hindu theology and overthrow the entire ethical system. "The worst of all evils to humanity," says Caird, "is to hallow evil by the authority and sanction of religion."[2]

The existence of evil practices in Hinduism and the proof of moral rottenness is not a demonstration of the absence of all good and good men, but it is complete refutation of the reckless and consciously mendacious representations of men like "Swami" Vivekananda regarding the religion of the Hindus. "The whole struggle in their system," said Vivekananda at Chicago, at the Parliament of Religions, "is a constant struggle to become perfect, to become divine, to reach God and see God and this reaching God, seeing God and becoming perfect, even as the Father in Heaven is perfect, constitutes the religion of the Hindus. And what becomes of man when he becomes perfect? He lives a life of bliss, infinite. He enjoys infinite and perfect bliss, having obtained the only thing in which man ought to have pleasure—God—and enjoys the bliss with

---

[1] Mitchell, *Hinduism, Past and Present*, pp. 175, 187, 219; Butler, *Land of the Vedas*, pp. 399, 471.

[2] Robson, *Hinduism and its Relation to Christianity*, pp. 276f.

God. So far all the Hindus are agreed. This is the common religion of all the sects of India."[1] Was the speaker thinking of Saktism, of which Monier Williams says that in it "we are confronted with the worst results of the worst superstitious ideas that have ever disgraced and degraded the human race. It is by offering to women the so-called homage of sensual love and carnal passion and by yielding free course to all the grosser appetites, wholly regardless of social rules and restrictions, that the worshippers of the female power (sakti) in nature seek to gratify the goddess representing that power, and through her aid to acquire supernatural faculties and even ultimately to obtain union with the Supreme Being. Incredible as it may appear, these so-called worshippers actually affect to pride themselves on their debasing doctrines, while they maintain that their creed is the grandest of all religions, because to indulge the grosser appetites and passions, with the mind fixed on union with the Supreme Being, is believed to be the highest of all pious achievements. Indeed, according to the distorted ideas and perverted phraseology of the sect, all who are uninitiated into this system are styled 'beasts' (pasu) the initiated being called Siddha, 'the perfect ones.'"[2] Vivekananda knew all this quite well and that the sacred books, the Tantras, which prescribe the ritual of Sakti worship, are too foul for translation, and that the bliss and divine perfection sought by Saktism are the bliss and perfection of absolutely devilish lust, and that all this has been a vital element in Hinduism for generations. I have spoken of this adventurer Vivekananda, and of his declaration in behalf of "all the sects of India" in connection with Saktism to bring out the indescribable immorality which Hinduism tolerates, and in one of its sects enjoins, and also to illustrate by Vivekananda himself the absence of a moral conscience in the matter of truthfulness, which is also, alas, a legitimate product of the Hindu religion.

But as has been intimated, Hinduism has no keen conception of truth and falsehood. Krishna himself in the *Mahabharata* declares, "One who speaks truth is righteous. There is nothing higher than truth. Behold, however, truth as practiced is exceedingly difficult to be understood as regards its essential attributes. Truth may be unutterable, and even falsehood may be utterable when falsehood would become truth and truth would become falsehood. In a situation of peril of life and in marriage, falsehood becomes utterable. In a situation involving the loss of one's entire property, falsehood becomes utterable. On an occasion of marriage, or of enjoying a woman, or when life is in danger, or when one's entire property is about to be taken away, or for the sake of a Brahman, falsehood may be uttered. These five kinds of falsehood have been declared to be sinless."

---

[1] *The World's Parliament of Religions*, Vol. II, p. 974.

[2] Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, pp. 190f.

It is not pleasant to dwell on these sad features of the Hindu religion. Ideas which hold the love or the fear of two hundred millions of our fellow creatures must not be treated with injustice or want of sympathy. But it is necessary to suggest at least some of the monstrous conceptions against which from time to time earnest men have made protest, and which have been assailed during the past century by the reform movements which are the subject of this chapter. Again and again in the history of India when polytheistic and pantheistic notions have been carried to extremes, reformers have arisen to recall the people to simple monotheism. The early Vaishnava Reformers of the twelfth, thirteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries taught "the existence of one supreme personal God of infinite power, wisdom and goodness, the Maker and Preserver of all things, a God whom they called Vishnu, and whom they believed to be distinct from the human soul and the material world."[1] The Vaishnava worship has led almost necessarily to corruption, however. Its doctrine of avatars and the character of the deity who was incarnate in them were not helpful, and "viler practices as a part of religion have flourished among the followers of Vishnu than among almost any other class of religionists." [2] In the sixteenth century a great monotheistic reaction came under the leadership of Kabir. His negative principles were clear and useful. He "discouraged the worship of all the Hindu gods and also the observance of Hindu rites and ceremonies of every description, whether orthodox or schismatical," but like the modern Arya Samaj and the Behais in Persia, his followers were allowed to refrain from acting upon their principles when it was advantageous to do so. Kabir, moreover, was very indefinite in his positive declarations of faith.[1] After Kabir came the Sikh reform under Nanak, who like Kabir, had been undoubtedly influenced by the stern monotheism of the Mohammedans, and both he and Kabir strove to fuse Hindus and Moslems in a common belief in one only God. This effort naturally failed, and Govind made it finally impossible when he turned the Sikh sect into a nation, and established a political dominion, wrested from Islam, in the Punjab.[2]

---

[1] Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, p. 476.

[2] Mitchell, *Hinduism, Past and Present*, p. 219.

These movements did not affect Bengal, in which lived the three great leaders of the Reform Movement of the last century who are to be described. Their movement has its logical connection, however, with the same spirit of reaction from popular, orthodox Hinduism to a purer faith which found expression in Kabir and Nanak, for in the sixteenth century the Vaishnava movement was inaugurated in Bengal by Chaitanya, a singularly attractive character, who went about preaching salvation by faith without works. It was the analogue of Luther's Reformation. He professed to oppose the Saktism that was then prevalent in Bengal, and he taught devotion of the human soul to Vishnu symbolized under the figure of human love. That and the licentious antinomianism, which was the inevitable consequence of his unbalanced doctrine, led to great degeneracy in some of the Vaishnava sects of Bengal. But his reform remained, as a memory, at least, of the effort of an earnest man to get back of the idols and the form of his faith, to the one, living God.[3]

Ram Mohun Roy, the founder of modern religious reform in India, was born in 1772, and was brought up in one of these Vaishnava sects in Bengal. Each morning he was accustomed to read a chapter in the Bhagavata Purana, the Vaishnava Bible, and being a lad of honest and careful mind, he found himself unable to accept it, and was led to turn back to the Vedic system—especially as expressed in the Upanishads. When he was sixteen, he wrote a vigorous attack upon idolatry, which led to an estrangement between him and his father, and he left home to study at Benares, and then in Thibet. When he was twenty, his father recalled him, and he gave himself to the study of English and to further mastery of Sanscrit. Later, he learned Arabic and Hebrew, so that he might study fairly the Koran and the Old Testament. Monier Williams says of him that he "was the first earnest minded investigator of the science of religion that the world has produced. From his earliest years he displayed an eagerness to become an unbiased student of all the religions of the globe. His sole aim in such studies was to seek out religious truth for himself with perfect fairness and impartiality."[1] These studies made him more and more dissatisfied with the idolatry and social customs of Hinduism.

---

[1] Vaughan, *The Trident, the Crescent and the Cross*, pp. 198f.

[2] Barth, *The Religions of India*, pp. 238–251; Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, Chs. V, VI.

[3] Vaughan, *The Trident, the Crescent and the Cross*, pp. 204f.; Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, pp. 138–142.

And the situation at the time in Bengal was such as to awaken the concern of such an honest and earnest man. The Saktis and Vaishnavas were both strong and contended for supremacy, but the general immorality and corruption of each were revolting. Socially the conditions were equally bad. The caste system was rigid as stone. "The horrible rites of suttee and infanticide were the order of the day. There were indeed many instances of true suttees . . . but it should not therefore be forgotten that in a great many instances the suttee was the victim of her greedy relatives, and in more, of rash words spoken in the first fit of grief, and of the vanity of her kindred who considered her shrinking from the first resolve an indelible disgrace."[2] "Many a horrible murder was thus committed, the cries and shrieks of the poor suttee being drowned by the sound of tomtoms, and her struggles made powerless by her being pressed down with bamboos. The condition of the Hindu female in those days was truly pitiable. Education among females was unknown. Kulinism, polygamy and every-day oppression made the life of the Hindu female unbearable. Hindu society with caste, polygamy, Kulinism, suttee, infanticide, and other evils was rotten to its core. Morality was at a very low ebb. Men spent their time in vice and idleness, and in social broils and party quarrels. As to education among the people, of what even the Muktubs could impart there was little. What little learning there was, was confined to a few Brahmans, and it was in the main a vain and useless learning. Ignorance and superstition reigned supreme over the length and breadth of the country. There was darkness over the land, and no man knew when it would be dispelled."[1]

---

[1] Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, p. 479.

[2] The Hindu sacred texts declare, "The woman who follows her husband expiates the sins of three races; her father's line, her mother's line, and the family of him to whom she was a virgin;" and "as long as a woman shall not burn herself after the death of her husband, she shall be subject to transmigration in a female form."

Ram Mohun Roy felt the shame of all this. He felt also the deepening influence of Western civilization as it was represented in the British Government in India and in the Western education which was beginning to be offered to the people. The movement which he began sprang even at the outset from, and as years went by became almost the direct product of, the innumerable dissolving agencies which Christian Government and Christian religion introduced into India.

Under these influences and impelled by his own earnest spirit Ram Mohun Roy soon made a public attack upon idolatry. His ground of opposition was not Christian but Vedic. Shortly after his father's death, he had issued a book in Persian, *Against the Idolatry of all Religions*. In 1816 he issued his first English book, entitled, *Translation of an Abridgment of the Vedant, or the Resolution of all the Veds, the most celebrated and revered work of Brahmanical Theology, establishing the unity of the Supreme Being; and that He alone is the object of Propitiation and Worship*. In the Introduction to this work he unhesitatingly sweeps away the apology for idolatry put forth by the "Higher Hinduism" representatives, and by many Western scholars. "I have observed," he says, "that both in their writings and conversation many Europeans feel a wish to palliate and soften the features of Indian idolatry; and are inclined to inculcate that all objects of worship are considered by their votaries as emblematical representations of the Supreme Divinity! If this were indeed the case, I might perhaps be led into some examination of the subject; but the truth is, the Hindus of the present day have no such views on the subject, but firmly believe in the real existence of innumerable gods and goddesses, who possess in their own departments, full and independent power; and to propitiate them, and not the true God, are temples erected and ceremonies performed."[2] All this Ram Mohun Roy contended, however, was contrary to the plain teachings of the Hindu scriptures. In the preface to the Mundaka Upanishad of the Atharva Veda, he says, "It will also appear evident that the Vedas, though they tolerate idolatry as the last provision for those who are totally incapable of raising their minds to the contemplation of the invisible God of nature, yet repeatedly urge the relinquishment of the rites of idol worship, and the adoption of a purer system of religion, on the express grounds that the observance of idolatrous rites can never be productive of eternal beatitudes. These are left to be practiced by such persons only as, notwithstanding the constant teaching of spiritual guides, cannot be brought to see perspicuously the majesty of God through the works of nature. The public will, I hope, be assured that nothing but the natural inclination of the ignorant towards the worship of objects resembling their own nature, and to the external form of rites palpable to their grosser senses, joined to the self-interested motives of their pretended guides, has rendered the generality of the Hindu community (in defiance of their sacred books) devoted to idol-worship :—the source of prejudice and superstition, and the total destruction of moral principle, as countenancing criminal intercourse, suicide, female murder and human sacrifice."

---

[1] Introduction to Ram Mohun Roy's English Works, Vol. I, pp. vi, vii, quoted in *The Brahmo Samaj and other Modern Eclectic Systems of Religion in India*, *Religious Reform*, Part IV, p. 4 f.

[2] "Hinduism has still great vitality. Max Muller, after describing in his lecture the most popular gods of the Hindu Pantheon, adds: 'But ask any Hindu, who can read, and write, and think, whether there are the gods he be-

Besides striking such a resolute blow at idolatry, and himself giving it up, Ram Mohun Roy rendered invaluable service in other directions, in advocating the civil rights of Hindus when they were scantily acknowledged, and in the abolition of widow burning. He denounced this as without Vedic sanction, and was in England when the appeal of the orthodox Hindus of Calcutta resisting the act of abolition as an attack upon their religion and an invasion of its necessary ceremonies, was laid before the King in Council. His testimony was of great value in securing the affirmation of the law of abolition.

Towards caste Ram Mohun Roy took a much feebler and more compromising attitude. He denounced it as demoralizing. In the

---

lieves in, and he will smile at your credulity.' And in his article he says : 'I ask Mr. Lyall, is this true, or is it not ?' If he will allow me to answer this question, I would say that perhaps a definition of the word 'think' might remove misconception, but, in so far as my experience goes, 'it is not true.' I have met Hindus who could read and write and think, and who soberly, firmly, and acutely maintained their faith in Vishnu and Siva, and even in the efficacy of worshipping their images" (Quoted from Robson's *Hinduism* by Lyall, *Asiatic Studies*, First Series, p. 161).

introduction to his translation of the Isopanishad, he says, "The chief part of the theory and practice of Hinduism, I am sorry to say, is made to consist in the adoption of a peculiar mode of diet, the least aberration from which is punished by exclusion from both family and friends. Murder, theft or polygamy, though brought home to the party by a judicial sentence, so far from inducing loss of caste, is visited with no peculiar mark of infamy." Yet he never gave up his own caste. The meeting-house of the Samaj he founded, was said to have a private room open only to Brahmans, and when he died in England, in 1833, where he had preserved his caste by having two Brahman servants with him, his Brahmanical thread was found coiled around his body. Even a friendly critic like Monier Williams, can only say of him in this matter, that "though far in advance of his age as a thinker, he laid no claim to perfection, or to perfect disinterestedness as a man." [1] One reason for his retention of his caste lay in the existing law, only altered in Lord William Bentinck's reform era, by which change of caste meant loss of property, and Ram Mohun Roy's wealth was considerable. Nor was he alone among reformers in preaching what he did not feel obliged to practice. Kabir was not his only precedent in India for such a course. And the outstanding weakness of Indian character is the failure to discern a necessary connection between principle and practice, truth and duty.

Yet Ram Mohun Roy was far beyond his day. He believed in one God, and in spiritual worship, and he longed for an indefinite sort of religious unity, in which he was prepared to mess all religions together. Towards Christianity as ethics, his attitude was favourable. He was the friend of many missionaries, assisting them in the translation of the Scriptures, joining them in worship, and discussing Christianity with them. He aided Duff in the establishment of his school in Calcutta, and defended the teaching of the Bible in it, and the use of the Lord's Prayer. The Serampore missionaries, however, felt that some public criticism should be made of his book, *The Precepts of Jesus the Guide to Peace and Happiness*, perhaps in the hope of influencing Ram Mohun Roy, but surely to prevent misconstruction which might follow silence on the part of the missionary body, as though Ram Mohun Roy's position were acceptable.[1] In a letter prefixed to one of his later works, he says, "The consequence of my long and uninterrupted researches into religious truth has been that I have found the doctrines of Christ more conducive to moral principles and better adapted for the use of rational beings, than any other which have come to my knowledge." At the same time, he rejected explicitly the idea of the Trinity. In his *Final Appeal* against what he deemed unfair constructions put on his book, *The Precepts of Jesus*, he said, "After I have long relinquished every idea of a plurality of Gods, or of the persons of the Godhead, taught under different systems of modern Hinduism, I cannot conscientiously and consistently embrace one of a similar nature, though greatly refined by the religious reformation of modern times. Since whatever arguments can be adduced against a plurality of Gods strike with equal force against the doctrine of a plurality of persons in the Godhead; and on the other hand, whatever excuse may be pleaded in favour of a plurality of persons in the Deity can be offered with equal propriety in defence of polytheism."

---

[1] *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, p. 488.

To say with Bose that Ram Mohun Roy had no deep conviction of sin, and that his religion lacked coherence, depth and earnestness,[2] with Max Müller, that his opinion about the Vedas betrayed a want of honesty or thoroughness of thought that retarded the natural growth of his work,[3] or with Monier Williams, that he never escaped from the influence of the Vedantic proclivities, and in all his anti-Brahmanism continued a Brahman to the end,[4] would doubtless be true; but it is more to our purpose here to note that he broke with idolatry, attacked many grievous wrongs of his own religion, and gave an impulse to monotheistic opinion and religious reform which lasts to this day, and expands with the years.

Apart from his personal influence and example, the great step taken by Ram Mohun Roy in this direction was the organization in Calcutta, in 1830, of the Brahma Sabha, or Society of Brahma, the one self-existent God of Hinduism. This was not intended to be a new sect or church, but simply a place of pure monothestic worship.

---

[1] Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, pp. 483f.; Stock, *History of the Church Missionary Society*, Vol. I, p. 305, Vol. II, pp. 501f.

[2] Bose, *Brahmoism*, pp. 38–42.

[3] Müller, *Biographical Essays*, p. 36.

[4] Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, pp. 484, 490.

"The trust deed of the building," which was endowed, "laid down that it was to be used as a place of meeting for the worship of the Eternal, Unsearchable and Immutable Being who is the Author and Preserver of the Universe; that no graven image, statue or sculpture, carving, painting, picture, portrait, or likeness of anything shall be admitted within the building, that no sacrifices shall be offered there; that nothing recognized as an object of worship by other men should be spoken of contemptuously there; and that no sermon be delivered but such as would have a tendency to promote piety, morality and charity."[1] This was the first Theistic Church planted in India, and in it for the first time Hindus united in public worship and prayer. It was the first sign of "the greatest change that has ever passed over the Hindu mind."[2]

In consequence of Ram Mohun Roy's absence and death in England, and in the want of any man of power to take his place, the Society which he had founded fell into the hands of men of less independence, and became more and more Hinduized. In 1841 or 1842, however, a young man joined it, who was to give it new life and sustain the cause until a greater than he should appear. This young man was named Debendranath Tagore. He was born in 1818, and was the son of a millionaire Hindu, who had been one of Ram Mohun Roy's closest friends and supporters, and whose "family nominally Brahmanical, was practically out of the pale of the Hindu communion. Some of his ancestors are said to have lost caste through involuntarily inhaling the smell of certain meat dishes cooked by Mohammedan hands."[3] He himself had received a sceptical education, and led a dissolute life, but "once on the occasion of a domestic calamity," he says, "as I lay drooping and wailing in a retired spot, the God of glory suddenly revealed Himself in my heart, and so entirely charmed me and sweetened my heart and soul, that for a time I continued ravished—quite immersed in a flood of light. What was it but the light of truth, the water of baptism, the message of salvation? . . . After a long struggle the world lost its attractions, and God became my only comfort and delight in this world of sorrow and sin." Prior to his joining the Brahma Sabha or

---

[1] *The Brahma Samaj, etc., Religious Reform*, Part IV, p. 8.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 16.

Brahmo Samaj as it came to be called, Debendranath had organized in 1839 a society of his own, to make known the religion of Brahma, entitled the Tattwabadhini, or Society for the Knowledge of the Truth, and this Society was kept up with occasional meetings at his home, until it was merged in the Brahmo Samaj in 1859.

Debendranath found the Samaj in a bad condition,—"a mere platform, where people of different creeds used to assemble week after week to listen to the discourses and hymns. Men by joining it pledged nothing, incurred nothing, and lost nothing. Many who attended these sessions were idolaters at home, and in fact knew not what the spiritual worship of the One True God meant."[1] He at once undertook to organize the Society with a president, a regularly ordained minister, a form of worship and some fixed standard of faith and practice.[2] The Brahmic Covenant which he prepared and introduced as the condition of membership, was as follows:

"Om

"I herewith embrace the Brahmic faith.

"1st Vow. I will worship, through love of Him and performance of the works He loveth, God the Creator, the Preserver, and the Destroyer, the Giver of Salvation, the Omniscient, the Omnipresent, the Blissful, the Good, the Formless, the One without a second.

"2d Vow. I will worship no created object as the Creator.

"3d Vow. Except the day of sickness or of tribulation, every day, the mind being undisturbed, I will engage it with love and veneration in God.

"4th Vow. I will exert to perform righteous deeds.

"5th Vow. I will be careful to abstain from vicious deeds.

"6th Vow. If through the influence of passion, I commit any vice, then, wishing redemption from it, I will make myself cautious not to do it again.

"7th Vow. Every year and on the occasion of every happy domestic event of mine, I will bestow gifts upon the Brahmo Samaj.

"Grant me, O God! power to observe the duties of this great faith.

"Om

"One only without a second."

---

[1] Pundit Sevanath Sastri, *The New Dispensation*, p. 5, quoted in *The Brahmo Samaj, etc.*, *Religious Reform*, Part IV, pp. 16f.

[2] Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, p. 492.

This real organization of the first Theistic Church occurred in 1844. In 1847, the number of those Brahmans who had taken the Covenant was seven hundred and sixty-seven. It would be easy to criticise the Covenant and to point out the immense chasm between it and Christianity, and also to indicate that while it guards against polytheism, it does not guard against pantheism, and makes use of the old pantheistic formula, "One only without a second." At the same time, the Covenant marked a real advance. It committed men to something. It forbade idolatry. And it did in reality reach out towards a monotheistic faith. If it could be accepted by a pantheist, there were yet other teachings of the Samaj which clearly distinguished between the creating God and His created works. There was a more conscientious effort made under this new development of the Samaj to cut loose from the old evils. Debendranath says that he "would wander away from his house, in sun and rain, in those days when the great goddess Durga would be worshipped by his parents and relations, simply to avoid taking part, in the least, in any idolatrous ceremony." Evidently his father, a member of Ram Mohun Roy's Samaj, had fewer scruples.

Another advance step was taken in the matter of the society's basis of authority. Ram Mohun Roy, while making use of the Upanishads, was really an eclectic, and unstinted in his praise of the ethics of Christianity and of Jesus as a moral teacher. Debendranath on the other hand, did not allow Christ's name to be mentioned, on the ground that some people called Him God. The Christian element fell into the background. His aim was to reform Hinduism by reverting wholly to Vedic doctrine and ritual.[1] But this was a step backward in order to a yet larger step forward. For doubts soon arose as to the authority of the Vedas. A thorough examination was made, and "in the end it was decided by the majority, that neither Vedas nor Upanishads[2] were to be accepted as an infallible guide. Only such precepts and ideas in them were to be admitted as harmonized with pure theistic truth, such truth resting on the two chief foundations of external nature and internal intuition. Moreover, the religion of Indian Theists was held to be one of equilibrium—that is, a system, balanced by intuition, reason, authority, personal experience, observation, and faith."[1] This was the end of the authority of the Hindu sacred books in this Samaj. Any special inspiration or infallibility or superiority ceased to be claimed for them, and the term Vedantist was given up.

---

[1] Vaughan, *The Trident, the Crescent and the Cross*, p. 210.

[2] The Upanishads are sometimes spoken of, especially by the Arya Samaj, as distinct from the Vedas, but they are themselves part of the Vedas, "the hidden spiritual doctrine of the Veda" as Monier Williams calls them. "According to a learned Brahman who is now a convert to Christianity," he adds, "the Upanishads are to the Mantras and Brahmanas what our New Testament is to the Old" (*Brahmanism and Hinduism*, p. 26).

Shortly after this, Debendranath published a treatise called *Brahma-Dharma* or *The Theistic Religion.* "It is to be noted that the neuter word Brahma is used for God—a word which seems inconsistent with the idea of personality and Fatherhood."[2] The four "Fundamental Principles of the Brahma Faith" were given as follows:

"1. In the beginning before this Universe was, the One Supreme Being was; nothing else whatever was; He has created all this universe.

"2. He is eternal, intelligent, infinite, blissful, self-dependent, formless, one only without a second, all-pervading, all-governing, all-sheltering, all-knowing, all-powerful, unmovable, perfect, and without a parallel.

"3. By worship of Him alone can happiness be secured in this world and the next.

"4. Love towards Him, and performing the works He loves, constitute His worship."

As to moral teaching, the Society under Debendranath advocated a not unworthy system of ethics and declared against penances, pilgrimages, sacrifices and caste. In these matters, however, in Ram Mohun Roy's spirit, it was disposed to be easy. The Samaj was in a real sense what Barth calls it, "a Hindu Sect,"[3] and so far as actual and aggressive reform was concerned, it pursued a course of compromise, overlooking the fact that Hinduism will make room for any doctrinal views whatsoever, provided only these views are not allowed to touch the real character of Hinduism as a social and not a religious system. The want of aggressiveness and courage in the

[1] Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, p. 494.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 494.

[3] Barth, *The Religions of India*, p. 292.

Brahmo Samaj was due to the want of these in its leaders. Debendranath was rich and easy-going, and did not desire any unpleasant ruptures or disturbance. A great difference between Debendranath and the reformers who preceded and followed him lay in the absence in his case of any real Christian influence. He had not studied the Christian books or felt the power of its faith. And this accounts for much of the passiveness, the want of initiative, the florid orientalism of the man. As Mr. Mozoomdar, the best known of the later Reform leaders says, "Debendra's prayers were the overflow of great emotional impulses stirred by intense meditation on the beauties and glories of nature. His utterances were grand, fervid, archaic, profound as the feelings were which gave them rise. But they seldom recognized the existence of sins and miseries in human nature, or the sinner's necessity for salvation. Debendranath had never received the advantages of a Christian training. His religious genius was essentially Vedic, Aryan, national, rapturous. The only element of Semitic mysticism which he ever imbibed was from the ecstatic effusions of the Persian poet Hafiz. But the characteristic of the Hafizian, or Sufi order of poetry, is not ethical or Christian, but sentimental and so to say Hindu. Debendra's mind assimilated it most naturally. He believed all sinfulness and carnality to be the private concerns of each individual man, which ought to be conquered by resolute moral determination."[1] Under the influence of this type of leadership, the Samaj was not likely to lead men to vigorous action or to create in them that sense of duty which cannot be comfortable until the dreams of the soul are realized in the practice of the life.

In 1857 a young man joined the Brahmo Samaj who was to supply Hindu Reform with a new type of leadership. His name was Keshub Chunder Sen, and he was born of a good family, of the Vaidya or medical caste, in Calcutta in 1838. He was a lad of ability, of a wide range of capacities, who had received an education which made him well acquainted with English, and who was intimate with a number of missionaries. From the first he says he believed in prayer. He was an amateur actor and juggler, and he combined singular intelligence, purity of character, and a suspicious reserve of nature. The same year he entered the Samaj he had organized a religious society called the "Goodwill Fraternity." His English education, his general reading of Christian theology and philosophy, his boldness of character, and the gradual emancipation of his mind from the Vaishnava worship and superstition in which he had been brought up, prepared him for a more courageous rupture with Hinduism than had been possible in the case of Debendranath and Ram Mohun Roy. At first he held himself in the background, and in subservience to Debendranath; but almost from the outset he began his course of aggressive attack on Hindu evils.

---

[1] *Life of Keshub Chunder Sen*, p. 159.

From the beginning he dealt with Brahmo doctrine with a bold hand. Debendranath had leaned for the most part upon Nature when the Vedas were abandoned, though the element of intuition was present, too. Keshub Chunder Sen practically dropped Nature. It had proved a dangerous basis of authority. He boldly rested all on intuition. In one of his earliest tracts he wrote: "Brahmoism rests on no written revelation; neither does it hang on the opinions of particular persons or communities. It depends not upon the fugitive phenomena incident to age or country. Its basis is the depth of human nature. Brahmoism is founded upon those principles which are above, anterior to and independent of reflection—which the variations of opinion cannot alter or affect. It stands upon intuitions. Intuitions are self-evident. They are self-evident truths which do not admit of demonstration." In other tracts he further attacked the "yoke of books and churches," "antiquated symbols and lifeless dogmas," especially "the dogma of a book revelation," holding that "revelation is subjective." In these tracts he quoted from Locke, Reid, Coleridge, Cousin, Hamilton, Greg, F. W. Newman, and others, and especially from Theodore Parker, who was at this time one of the dominant influences in his thought.

If Keshub had been willing to confine himself to theological discussion, or even to temperate oral attacks on Hindu evils, there would probably have been no objection or difficulty; but he was not content to do this. He finally assailed the corruptions of Hindu life and struck straight at its evils. Dr. Murdock condenses his statement of the wrongs which called for immediate remedy:

> "There can be no doubt that the root of all the evils which afflict Hindu society, that which constitutes the chief cause of its degradation is idolatry. Idolatry is the curse of Hindustan, the deadly canker that has eaten into the vitals

of native society. It would be an insult to your superior education to say that you have faith in idolatry, that you still cherish in your hearts reverence for the gods and goddesses of the Hindu pantheon, or that you believe in the thousand and one absurdities of your ancestral creed. But however repugnant to your understanding and repulsive to your good taste the idolatry of your forefathers may be, there is not a thorough appreciation of its deadly character on moral grounds. It will not do to retain in the mind a speculative and passive disbelief in its dogmas; you must practically break with it as a dangerous sin and an abomination; you must give it up altogether as an unclean thing. You must discountenance it, discourage it, oppose it and hunt it out of your country. For the sake of your souls and for the sake of the souls of the millions of your countrymen, come away from hateful idolatry, and acknowledge the one Supreme and true God, our Maker, Preserver and Moral Governor, not in belief only, but in the every-day concerns and avocations of your life.

"Next to idolatry and vitally connected with its huge system is caste. Kill the monster, and form a national and religious brotherhood of all your reformed countrymen.

"Thirdly, our marriage customs involve evils of great magnitude which urgently call for reform, *e. g.*, polygamy, premature marriage, prohibition of widow remarriage, and countless restrictions.

"Fourthly, the zenana requires thorough reform."[1]

In his "Appeal to Young India," he addresses the young men directly in these terms: "Look at yourselves, enchained to customs, deprived of freedom, lorded over by an ignorant and crafty priesthood, your better sense and better feelings all smothered under the crushing weight of custom; look at your homes, scenes of indescribable misery, your wives and sisters, your mothers and daughters immured within the dungeons of the zenana, ignorant of the outside world, little better than slaves whose charter of liberty of thought and action has been ignored; look at your social constitution and customs, the mass of enervating, demoralizing and degrading curses they are working. Watch your daily life, how almost at every turn you meet with some demand for the sacrifice of your conscience, some temptation to hypocrisy, some obstacle to your improvement and true happiness."

It was impossible that a man of this character who meant what he said should get along for any extended period with Debendranath, especially if he felt really called to act upon his belief. And this

---

[1] *The Brahmo Samaj, etc., Religious Reform*, Part IV, p. 29.

Keshub plainly declared he did. He clearly defined the conditions under which reform agitation was legitimate:

"A firm sense of duty ought to be the basis of all reform movements. It is dangerous to undertake them from any other motive.

"Secondly, those who desire to reform their country must first reform themselves. Good examples are always powerful engines of conversion, while the fervid eloquence of hypocritical teaching obstructs instead.

"Lastly, the paths of reformation are thorny, and therefore they who tread these paths must be prepared for the thorns; there is no royal road to reformation."

In accordance with these principles, Keshub persuaded his wife to dine at Debendranath's house. As Debendranath belonged to a family of practically excommunicated Brahmans, this outrage on Keshub's part "led to his temporary expulsion by his uncle from his home and family."[1] He then strove to secure a rule that all who conducted the services at the Samaj meeting-place should lay aside the Brahmanical thread. Debendranath agreed to lay aside his own, but not to use the Samaj to enforce such a reform. Then he attacked the rites connected with the worship of deceased ancestors, encouraged women to join the Brahmo Samaj, though they sat behind a screen, and moved for a reform of marriage customs. Debendranath and the older members were conservative and timid as to actual changes, though bold enough in resisting radical reform; and in 1865 a breach came, and Keshub and his party seceded, and the following year established a separate society which they called the "Brahmo Samaj of India," while the older organization was henceforth known as the Adi or Original Brahmo Samaj. Since this rupture the Adi Samaj has accomplished little. The younger and more courageous organization has supplanted it and it has drifted back towards orthodox Hinduism. "Hinduism," one of the Adi Samaj champions has claimed, "is the best of all prevailing religions,"[2] and Rajanarayana Bose, one of its leading members, included the Tantras, already spoken of for their foulness, among the recognized Scriptures.[3] The weekly meetings have been kept up by the endowments, but in 1881 it was said, "the large number of members, who at one time signed the covenant, have quietly disappeared amongst the mass of idolatrous Hindus, and many of them do not now take even a faint interest in the cause they once advocated."[1]

---

[1] *The Brahmo Samaj, etc., Religious Reform*, Part IV, p. 28.

[2] Bose, *Brahmoism*, p. 58.

[3] Mitchell, *Hinduism, Past and Present*, p. 229.

The new society, however, at once entered upon a vigorous life. Its creed was to be "The Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man," and Keshub looked forward to the establishment of "The Church of the Future," as he styled it in a lecture in 1869, which would embrace truth from every religion and supply a common faith to all men. In his ecclesiastical conceptions, as in everything else, Keshub Chunder Sen had advanced a long way beyond Ram Mohun Roy. The earlier repugnance to dogmas which Keshub had displayed, gave way now, and the new Brahmo Samaj drew up its own system of doctrine, the substance of which was as follows:

> "God is the first cause of the universe. By His will He created all objects out of nothing, and continually upholds them. He is spirit, not matter. He is perfect, infinite, all-merciful, all holy. He is our Father, Preserver, Master, King and Saviour.
>
> "The soul is immortal. Death is only the dissolution of the body. There is no new birth on earth after death; the future life is a continuation and development of the present life. The men that now live are the embryos of the men that are to be.
>
> "The true Scriptures are two—the volume of nature and the natural intuitions implanted in the mind. The wisdom, power and mercy of the Creator are written on the universe. All ideas about immortality and morality are primary convictions rooted in the constitution of man.
>
> "God Himself never becomes man by putting on a human body. His divinity dwells in every man, and is displayed more vividly in some; as in Moses, Jesus Christ, Mohammed, Nanak, Chaitanya, and some other great Teachers, who appeared at special times, and conferred vast benefits on the world. They are entitled to universal gratitude and love.
>
> "The Brahma religion is distinct from all other systems of religion; yet it is the essence of all. It is not hostile to other creeds. What is true in them it accepts. It is based on the constitution of man, and is, therefore, eternal and universal. It is not confined to age or country.
>
> "All mankind are of one brotherhood. The Brahma religion recognizes no distinction between high and low caste. It is the aim of this religion to bind all mankind into one family.

---

[1] Pundit Sivanath Sastri, *The New Dispensation*, p. 13.

> "Duties are of four kinds: (1) Duties towards God—such as belief in Him, love, worship, and service; (2) Duties towards self—such as preservation of bodily health, acquisition of knowledge, sanctification of soul; (3) Duties towards others—such as veracity, justice, gratitude, the promotion of the welfare of all mankind; (4) Duties towards animals and inferior creatures—such as kind treatment.
>
> "Every sinner must suffer the consequences of his own sins sooner or later, in this world or the next. Man must labour after holiness by the worship of God, by subjugation of the passions, by repentance, by the study of nature and of good books, by good company and by solitary contemplation. These will lead through the action of God's grace to salvation.
>
> "Salvation is a deliverance of the soul from the root of corruption and moral disease, and its perpetual growth in purity. Such growth continues through all eternity, and the soul becomes more and more godly and happy in Him who is the fountain of infinite holiness and joy. The companionship of God is the Indian Theists' heaven."[1]

It will be seen at a glance that this creed owes more both in its omissions and in its assertions, to Christianity than to anything else. There was a strain of Vaishnava devotion and sentimentalism in Keshub, and there was a great deal of what was best in Hindu theology, but his system was Christianity, as filtered through Theodore Parker and the English Unitarians, and Hinduized enough to catch the Bengali imagination. This was true prior to his visit to England in 1870, when he set the example, both by his conduct and utterances, for the increasing stream of liberal Hindus who have visited Great Britain and America. "Spare me and my countrymen the infliction of antiquated and lifeless dogmas." "I cannot but feel perplexed and even amused, amidst countless and quarrelling sects." How familiar these sentences sound! They have become part of the stock in trade for Oriental visitors, with which they tickle the ears of that large class of people here who could not define dogma if they tried and who do not venture into sufficiently close contact with sects to be hurt by them—or helped. In England, Keshub was made much of—especially by the Unitarians in whose pulpits he preached, and by others who hoped that the progress of his thought would bring him nearer to the standards of historic Christianity. As we shall see, this hope was vain. His visit to England gave him, as he said, a deep admiration for the Christian home, but it did not alter his views. "The result of my visit to England," he said, "is that I came here an Indian. I go back a confirmed Theist. I have not accepted a single new doctrine that God has not put into my mind before; I have not accepted new dogmas and doctrines; but I have tried as far as possible to imbibe the blessed influence of Christian lives." Two of his Hindu travelling companions, however, were subsequently baptized.[1]

---

[1] Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, pp. 503f.

On his return to India he took up reform with new zeal, and established the Indian Reform Association, which did an energetic work for a while, but subsequently declined, with only now and then a temporary revival. One of the reform measures in securing which he was most active, was the Native Marriage Act of 1872, which for the first time introduced civil marriage into Hindu society, legalizing marriages between castes, and fixing the minimum age of the bridegroom in such civil marriages at eighteen, and of the bride at fourteen, but requiring written consent of parents or guardians when either party was under twenty-one. The act prohibited bigamy and permitted the remarriage of widows. Keshub was active in the promotion of other reforms also, as well as in preaching the Brahmo doctrine. He had borrowed the methods of missionaries in the propagation of Brahmoism, and by preachers and papers and tracts was exerting a wide influence.

Everything was not going smoothly, however, within the organization. Before his visit to England, there had been some strange outbursts of fanaticism, in which some of his followers had prostrated themselves before him, and called him "lord" and "saviour," and some "sang hymns about him as a Yogi, whose heart is the abode of the perfect God."[2] This led to strong remonstrance on the part of the more sensible members, who accused him of encouraging such worship. After his return from England, dissension arose over the place of women in the Samaj meetings, some contending for the right to have their wives and daughters sit with them, and not separate behind a screen. Keshub resisted this, but a compromise was affected. Furthermore, there was some dislike of his course in professing ascetic practices, cooking his own meals, sitting on a bare wooden stool all day, mending his own clothes, etc., while at the same time purchasing and residing in a fine mansion which he bought for 20,000 rupees. And there was steadily increasing dissatisfaction with his assumption of authority in the Samaj. These clouds of discontent broke in 1878, and the cause of their breaking was the break down of Keshub Chunder Sen's character for sincerity and good faith.

---

[1] Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, p. 506.

[2] *The Brahma Samaj, etc., Religious Reform*, Part IV, p. 32f.

He had been foremost in securing the Native Marriage Law, providing civil marriage for those not belonging to the Christian, Jewish, Hindu, Mohammedan, Parsee, Buddhist, Sikh or Jain religions, and fixing the age limit for such marriages. But in this year, 1878, he married his daughter not yet fourteen to the Maharajah of Kuch-Behar, who was under sixteen. This naturally caused a storm of protest within the Samaj. His reply was that (1) the marriage in question was a departure from the letter only, not from the spirit of the act, (2) that he was not responsible for the idolatrous rites with which it was accompanied, (3) that it was eminently fitted to advance the interests of Brahmoism, and (4) that his consent was given in consequence of an express command from heaven.[1] But such shuffling and sophistry did not satisfy his associates, and after some violent meetings in which Keshub and his party invoked the aid of the police, the Samaj split asunder, the new Society taking the name of Sadharan or Universal Samaj.

This secession removed the restraint which had limited the vagaries of the leader, and thenceforth until his death in 1884, he ran his course unimpeded, and it was a sad and erratic course. He began it on January, 1879, with an address entitled "Am I an Inspired Prophet?'" He declared that this question had "gathered force from year to year, like rising and swelling surges from province to province, till it assumed the formidable proportions of a national problem." "Again and again has India asked me 'Art thou an inspired prophet?'" "Far from being a prophet," he answered, "I am myself in need of prophetic guidance and help. Then what am I, if I am not a prophet? I am a singular man. I am not as ordinary men are, and I say this deliberately." He proceeds then to charge that he is inspired and that those who protest against his proceedings "protest against the dispensations of God Almighty, the God of all Truth and Holiness."

He returned now to the subject of Christ. In 1866 he had delivered an address entitled "Jesus Christ; Europe and Asia." This was when he broke with Debendranath, who, it will be remembered, would not allow Christ to be mentioned in the meetings. At that time, Keshub startled the missionaries and the home churches by the warmth and boldness of his admiration of Christ. "Was He not above ordinary humanity?" he asked. "Blessed Jesus, immortal child of God." But he at once took the edge off the significance of this address by another, entitled "Great Men," in which he levelled Jesus down to humanity again. Now he again startled men with an address entitled "Who is Christ?" in which he said, "Christ struck the keynote of His doctrine when He announced His divinity before an astonished and amazed world in these words, 'I and My Father are one.' I can answer you, my friends, that I love Christ and honour Him more for the sake of these words than for anything else. For these memorable and imperishable words furnish an index to the mystery and glory of His real character. Were it not for this bold assertion of identity with the Godhead, I would not honour Christ so much as I do." These were remarkable words, but it soon became evident that that integrity and discerning insight of moral judgment which had ceased to mark Keshub Chunder Sen's conduct had ceased to characterize his thought also. He had already resolved Christ into a moral principle. "Truly analyzed," he says, "Jesus Christ means simply love of God and love of man." He calls Him an idea, a plan of life, purity of character, not concrete but abstract, self-surrender, asceticism, yoga, obedient and humble worship. "Christ is nothing more."[1]

---

[1] Bose, *Brahmoism*, p. 115.

In consistency with this loose and indefinite style of speech, Keshub began to advance other ideas as vague and unsubstantial. He came under the influence of a Sakti worshipper, the Paramhansa Ramkrishna, a devotee who gained a great influence over him. The Sakti worship addresses itself, as has been intimated, to the female principle in the Hindu idea of God. Under this influence Keshub began to talk of the Motherhood of God and issued proclamations in the name of the Mother God, which were as blasphemous as they were absurd. Foolish practices were taken up in this same wild sensational spirit, and a room in Keshub's house became a place of resort for pilgrims who there met and held intercourse with the spirits of Moses, Socrates, Buddha, Mohammed, and later of Faraday, Carlyle and Emerson. It would have been interesting to be present on the night of the Carlyle séance, if only the original might have been brought in to express his sentiments.

---

[1] Bose, *Brahmoism*, pp. 76f.

In 1881 the growing wildness of the Reformer issued in the proclamation of "The New Dispensation," which was to include a new church, "The Church of the New Dispensation." "Christ's Dispensation is said to be divine," he declared, "I say that this Dispensation is equally divine. . . . Its distinguishing feature is its immediacy, its denial of a mediator. . . . There is another characteristic of the present dispensation which distinguishes it from all other religions. It is inclusive, while they are more or less exclusive. . . . This includes all religions. . . . It is the harmony of all Scriptures and prophets and dispensations." And again, "It is an explanation of pantheism and polytheism. It is Christ's kingdom of heaven. . . . It is the dawn of the Satya Yug or the Golden Age of universal peace. It is Christ's Second Advent. It is the philosophy of the Trinity. . . . It is the third Testament." It was to accomplish this vast reconciliation by the abysmal immorality of ignoring all lines of distinction between truth and falsehood and setting the seal of divine approval upon an unlimited and lawless subjectivism.

The Church of the New Dispensation borrowed freely from Christian rites and Hindu ceremonies alike. It invented a tropical affluence of symbols and sacraments. It even introduced substantial idolatries, and Keshub's organ reverted to those arguments in palliation of what he had once called the fatal root of the tree of Hindu corruption which Keshub Chunder Sen had formerly scorned. "Hindu idolatry is not to be altogether overlooked or rejected. As we explained some time ago, it represents millions of broken fragments of God. Collect them together and you get the indivisible Divinity."

Much of Keshub's influence during his last years simply played into the hands of the champions of orthodox Hinduism, with all its idolatries and corruptions; but it is a pleasant thing that his final public address, "Asia's Message to Europe," in 1883,[1] with much folly yet included words like these: "All India must believe that Christ is the Son of God. Nay more than this, I will make myself bold to prophesy, all India will one day acknowledge Jesus Christ as the atonement, the universal atonement for all mankind. . . . He has given His precious blood for all of us, whether we believe it or not. . . . He has done His work, let us do ours. Let us all believe that

---

[1] Phillips Brooks was in Calcutta early in this year and he wrote an interesting letter to his brother about his visit to Keshub Chunder Sen:

February 2, 1883.

DEAR ARTHUR:—Calcutta itself has not many sights, and so it is the people whom one wants most to see. This morning I spent two hours with Keshub Baboo Chunder Sen. And I'll tell you about him. I told old Mr. Dall, the venerable Unitarian missionary here, that I wanted to see the head of the New Dispensation, and the minister of the Brahmo Samaj (which is another name for the same thing) sent back word that he would be at home at nine o'clock to-day. On the Circular Road, one of the chief streets of the city, there is a big house all surrounded on three stories with verandas, standing inside a garden, around which is a high pink-washed wall. On the gate-post is inscribed the name of Lily Cottage which, I believe, was the title which a previous occupant gave to the place. Driving in under a great porte cochere, we were shown up to a very large, high parlour in the second story, where we waited for the prophet. It was furnished comfortably but not tastefully in European style, with rather cheap pictures on the walls. I noticed especially an engraving of the Queen, which had been presented to Keshub by Her Majesty; also a very poor little painting of the man himself, sitting on the Himalayas with a woman by his side, he holding a long guitar-like instrument in his hand, and clad in the skin of a tiger. At one end of the room hung a familiar chromo-lithograph of Christ, after Carlo Dolci, holding the sacramental cup, and with the right hand raised in blessing,—a large, cheap Christian picture. While we were looking about, Chunder Sen came in, a rather tall and sturdy man of forty-five, with a bright, kindly, open face, a round head, and black mustache and somewhat short cut black hair. He wore the Eastern white mantle thrown over his shoulders, and apparently covering a more or less European dress. He gave me a most kindly greeting, and at once began to talk. I asked him questions, and he answered freely and at length. It made me feel very like an interviewer, but it was the best way to get at what I wanted. He said that the central position of Brahmo Samaj was pure theism. It stood fairly between Indian Pantheism on one side and Indian Idolatry on the other, insisting fully on the Unity and Personality of God, and freely calling Him "Father," believing in this God's perpetual and universal presence. It found his prophets everywhere, and aimed to hold all the good and true of all systems and all teachers "in Christ." He mentioned, especially, Socrates, Mohammed, and Buddha. When you tried to find just what he meant by holding the truth of them "in Christ," he eluded you. He constantly asserted that he held Christ to be in unique sense the "Son of God," but said he could not any further explain his meaning of that phrase. He rejected all idea of Incarnation. Nor would he own that Christ, in His historic teaching, was in any way the test by which other teachers should be judged. He talked much of "Communion with Christ," but defined it as such profound contemplation of his character as produced entire sympathy with him, not allowing anything like personal intercourse with a Christ now living and communicating with us. Still he clung strongly to that phrase "in Christ." He described very interestingly the "Pilgrimages" of the Brahmo Samaj to Socrates or Buddha or Mohammed or Carlyle, which consist of gathering in front of the church and singing hymns and reading some of the great

He has died for you and me, and the atonement on our side is completed. Fellow countrymen, be ye reconciled through Him!" The truth of God is in these words, whether or no Keshub Chunder Sen saw it with clear eyes and embraced it with the simple heart of true faith. And however weak he showed himself and whatever harm he did, no man without honesty and earnestness in his heart could break with

teacher's sayings, and then going inside and sitting still and entering into communion with his character. Besides these, and as something more sacred, they have occasionally the Lord's Supper, which is celebrated with Indian sweetmeats and water, and centres in mystic contemplation of the character of Jesus. They have also a baptism, which is quite optional, and strangely keeps association with the Hindu ablutions on the one hand and with the Christian baptism on the other. He was very interesting in his account of how he freely uses the terms of the old Hindu mythology, talking of Siva and Vishnu and Parvati as different sides of Deity, and hoping so to win the people to spiritual views of what they have long held materially, and to construct in their minds a unity out of the fragments of Divine Ideal, of which their books are full. Thus he hopes some day to appeal to the common superstitious Hindu mind, though thus far the movement has been mostly confined to the higher classes, who have been reached by English education. He said some fine things about the orientalism of Christ and Christianity and about the impossibility of India ever becoming Christian after the European sort. At the same time he said unreservedly that the future religion of India would be a Christ religion. The asceticism to which he clings is of a very healthy human sort, rejecting entirely the old ideas of the Fakirs. He pointed to the picture on the wall and said that there he had had himself painted as a Vedic Rishi, but had especially taken care to have his wife painted by his side to show that the true asceticism kept still the family life. As to the peculiar worship of their society, he told of the new "Dance" which has been lately introduced, and which had been much abused. It is according to him, neither more nor less than the Methodist camp-meeting principle of the physical expression of spiritual emotion putting itself into oriental shape. For himself he eats no meat and drinks no wine, but these restrictions are not enforced nor universal, though they are very commonly observed as a protest against the self-indulgence into which modern India is largely running as it departs from its old faiths.

All this and much more was told with a quiet glow and earnestness which was very impressive. The basis and inspiration of it all was intuition. There was no reference to any authority. Indeed he almost boasts that he never reads. Even his Christ seemed to be One of whom he knew not so much by the New Testament as by personal contemplation. He shrinks from dogma and definition, and eludes you at every turn. He is the mystic altogether. As we got up and went out we passed a room where his household and some other disciples were at morning worship. Eight or ten men sat cross-legged on the floor with closed eyes, while one fine-looking fellow in the midst murmured a half audible prayer. In one corner of the room was a rustic booth devoted to supreme contemplation, in which sat one worshipper, who seemed more absorbed even than the others. At the feet of the men lay drums and other musical instruments, to which they would by and by sing a hymn. We had heard them singing as we sat talking with Keshub Baboo. Behind the thin curtains you could just see the women's fans. Chunder Sen stood and looked in with us at the door and told us all about it, and he bade us a cordial farewell and promised some of his books and a photograph of himself which he has since sent.

This enough perhaps of Chunder Sen! but I thought you might care to hear of his ancestral faith as he did and struggle as he struggled to persuade his countrymen to take a better way to God than that which leads to the temple and the idols made with men's hands.

Since Keshub Chunder Sen's death the Brahmo Samaj, in the New Dispensation branch of it, has been, as Mr. Mozoomdar says, in a "condition of anarchy." In Keshub's life he saw within his own

what has interested me immensely. It is Indian mysticism fastening on Christ and trying to become the practical saviour of the country by him. They hold in full the idea of special national religions all embraced and included within the great religion of the Divine life made known in Jesus. Surely nothing could be more interesting than this. It is not Christianity, but it is the effort of India to realize Christ in her own way,—so far as I know, the only such attempt now being made in any heathen land. Already the natural divergences have shown themselves. There is the Adi Samaj, or old society, which desires to return purely to Vedic religion and will not hear of Christ because He is not in the Vedas; and there is the Sadharan Samaj, or advanced school of Free Religionists. There is also the Arya Samaj, which still calls itself Brahmanic, and hopes to reform Hinduism from within. The first three together have some one hundred and sixty congregations in India, of which some forty are of the Brahmo Samaj. I have been much interested in what the people here who care about religion say about Keshub and his New Dispensation. Some of the missionaries and other Christian people call him impostor out and out, and do not believe in his sincerity. I have been unable to get from them any grounds of their disbelief in him except that they think him conceited, and that he went back on some of his precepts about infant marriages in order to marry his daughter of thirteen to the Rajah of Kuch-Behar. An intelligent Brahman, with whom I talked, spoke of him with contempt and said his movement was fast dying out, and told of a strange new life in Hinduism, very much as the Orthodox churchman talks of Unitarians. Strangely enough, it is from high English churchmen that I have heard the most thoughtful and interested comments on the work. The Bishop of Bombay, a ritualist of very narrow sort, declared it to be most interesting, and the Bishop of Calcutta told me to-day that while he had no sympathy with mysticism and thought that Brahmo Samaj would come to nothing because it had no doctrinal basis, yet he counted Chunder Sen his friend, and praised his spirituality and earnestness. Our friends of the Cambridge Mission at Delhi were full of watchful interest in the new movement. Joseph Cook, when he was here, almost offended some of the missionaries by his interest in praise of Chunder Sen. And some of the missionaries of the German mission believe in his personal character, and watch his movement with much hope. Old Mr. Dall has never given in adherence to anything but the pure theism of the New Dispensation, but is constantly with them, and naturally enough is claimed by them as more theirs than he will himself allow.

I am almost ashamed of having written so much about him, but it does seem to me the very kind of thing for which we are all looking. Brahmo Samaj is not the end. It is only the first sign of the real working of the native soul and mind on Christ and His truth, which must sometime find far fuller light than it has found yet. I send you a copy of its paper of January 14th, which has (beginning on the first page) an article on Christian Mission Work in India, which I think must stir the heart of every missionary. The whole movement and its leader believe intensely in the Holy Spirit. And I believe that such embodiments of Christianity in India will sometime furnish, and such as this New Dispensation faintly and blunderingly suggests, will not merely be different from European organization more bitterness and factionalism than troubles the Christian Church whose sects and controversies he so deprecated. One great cause of dissension after his death was the position in the Church of Mr. Mozoomdar who seemed best fitted for the place of leadership, and who assumed that it would be his. His right to it was not conceded, however, and he has now withdrawn from public life with this despairing utterance:

> "Age and sickness get the better of me in these surroundings, I cannot work as I would—contemplation is distracted, concentration disturbed, though I struggle ever so much. These solitudes are hospitable; these breadths, heights and depths are always suggestive. I acquire more spirit with less struggle, hence I retire.
>
> "They talk and make me talk so much that having respect for them all, I prefer to go away.
>
> "I can best control my speech, my daily ways, my dealings with the world when I am lonely, and fall back upon myself. Therefore I retire.
>
> "My thirst for the higher life is growing so unquenchable that I need the time and the grace to re-examine and purify and reform every part of my existence. The Spirit of God promises me that grace if I am alone. So let me alone.
>
> "There is so much to learn, to trust, to realize, to do, that I must night and day draw nearer to my God. The society of men is full of vanity. So I retire. I will go back when I can serve men better.
>
> "The rich are so vain or selfish, the poor are so insolent or mean, that having respect for both I prefer to go away from them.
>
> "The learned think so highly of themselves, the ignorant are so full of hatred and uncharitableness, that having good will for both I prefer to hide myself from all.
>
> "The religious are so exclusive, the sceptical so self-sufficient, that it is best to be away from both.
>
> "Such a fatal liking I have for the company of every kind of men, so open to temptation at every point, so easily provoked, so repeatedly impatient that I must school myself to retirement and forgetfulness of all things.
>
> "Where are the dead? Have not they too retired? I wish my acquaintance with the dead should grow, that my communion with them should be spontaneous, perpetual, unceasing. I will invoke them and wait for them in my hermitage.
>
> "What is life? Is it not a fleeting shadow, the graveyard of dead hopes, the

---

Christianity, but will add something to it, and make the world of Christianity a completer thing, with its eastern and western halves both there, than it has ever been before. These are my views. Sometime soon I will write to you about something else. Now good-night. On Sunday I shall go to the cathedral in the morning and to Brahmo Samaj in the afternoon (Allen, *Life of Phillips Brooks*, Vol. II, pp. 394–398).

battle-field of ghastly competitions, the playground of delusions, separations, cruel changes and disappointments? I have had enough of these. And now with the kindliest love for all, must prepare and sanctify myself for the great Beyond, where there is solution for so many problems, and consolation for so many troubles.

"The world is also bright, beautiful, and full of God; but those who are in it do not see that—I see it better from my retirement, so farewell for a while.

"They have thought and said kind things to me so unstintedly that I could not help feeling flattered, though I knew they were undeserved; they have thought and said cruel and unworthy things of me so persistently that I could not help being discouraged. Now I must go away to make certain what I really am in the sight of my God. And furthermore I must strenuously strive to mature myself in whatever good thing there is in me, and purify myself with God's help from every evil. Does not this require much time and discipline?

"It is hard for a man to realize and far harder to worship the Spirit of God unless he himself is a pure spirit. But he is seldom that. He is mixed with passions, hatreds, motives that are of the animal, and makes of his God what he is himself. The world would not help him here. He must help himself, and when he cannot, God helps him. He must retire into solitude that this may be possible."

So this is the flower of the Brahmo Samaj development:

"He sat beneath a hollow tree
The hollow wind it blew.
He thought upon this hollow world
And all its hollow crew."

Controversy arose also between Keshub's family and others, as to the ownership of the house which constituted the Samaj's headquarters. The building was at last surrendered by the family to trustees. The New Dispensation Church, it is needless to say, is realizing none of its founder's spectacular prophesies. It may be doubted if it is not losing some of its original courage of conviction and clearness of perception of the impossibility of reconciling with the old Hindu conceptions, abandoned by Debendranath and Keshub Chunder Sen, the new conceptions, which they know to be true. As at the last Keshub relaxed the convictions regarding idolatry which he at first held, and dropped back to orthodox ground again, so the Dispensation has drifted back to the position regarding the Vedas which the Samaj had renounced forty years before. "We need not say much upon our return to Vedanta,"[1] said the *Liberal and New Dispensation* in 1885. "This is a known fact. The foundation of Brahmoism was laid upon the Upanishads. Although we have advanced, the foundation remains as it was."

The establishment of the Sadharan Brahmo Samaj at the time of the rupture over the Kuch-Behar marriage, has been referred to. Twenty-nine provincial Samajes and 425 Brahmas and Brahmicas supported the schism. The conditions of ordinary membership imposed by the Sadharan Samaj were as follows: the applicant must be over eighteen years of age, and sign the Samaj covenant accepting the four principles of Brahmoism (1) its immediacy—freedom from all doctrines of mediation or intercession, (2) its independence—freedom from the fetters of infallible books or men, (3) its catholicity—its broad sympathy for all truth wherever found, and its warm appreciation of the great and good of every land, (4) its spirituality or freedom from all external forms and ceremonies; also he must have a pure moral private character, breach of morality in private life rendering a member liable to expulsion, and he must contribute eight annas or sixteen cents annually to the work of the Samaj.[2] As these conditions made orthodox Hindus, observers of caste and worshippers of idols, eligible to membership, as was intended, a second order of members came into existence, as in other Samajes also, although the Sadharan Samaj is said to contain most of them. These are called Anusthanic Brahmas. Monier Williams says that there are little more than 800 of these all told in all the Samajes who agree to be really consistent Brahmas and shake off caste, all idolatry, and all Hindu rites.[3] The doctrinal differences between the Brahmo Samaj and the Sadharan Samaj are not important, save that the latter asserts that punishment for sin cannot last to eternity, while the former declares that the consequences of sin reach on into the next world, and can cease only when the sinner turns to the merciful Father and becomes reconciled to Him.

---

[1] The terms Vedanta and Vedantism are not used here in their philosophic sense in which pure Vedantism stands for pure pantheism, the Vedantist believing in "one impersonal Spirit, who by association with Illusion becomes the one supreme personal God of the world (of illusion)" (Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, p. 36. See *Papers for Thoughtful Hindus*, No. 9, "On Vedantism," by Lal Behai Dey; No. 14, "Hindu Pantheism," by R. Flint, from *Anti Theistic Theories*).

[2] *The Brahmo Samaj., etc., Religious Reform*, Part IV, pp. 62, 63.

[3] *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, p. 525.

The developments of the reform movement thus far described have centred in Calcutta. The movement has, however, extended elsewhere in India. In 1864 Keshub Chunder Sen visited Madras, and in consequence, a society called the Veda Samaj was established, which in 1871, cut loose from any mention of the Vedas, and also from the articles in the original covenant which explicitly allowed members to comply with Hindu ceremonies "where their omission will do more violence to the feelings of the Hindu community than is consistent with the proper interests of the Veda Samaj." This was to be done as matter of routine and the members were never to "stoop to equivocation or hypocrisy in order to avoid unpopularity." This is another illustration of the utterly immoral want of logic or sense of ethical consistency in Hinduism and the spirit which it creates. In Western India a Prarthana Samaj or Prayer Society was organized in Bombay in 1867, which has developed into similar societies in other cities. The main articles of its constitution were: 1. I believe in one God. 2. I renounce idolatry. 3. I will do my best to lead a moral life. 4. If I commit any sin, through the weakness of my moral nature, I will repent of it and ask the pardon of God.[1] But Dr. Murdock says "the Theism of Western India has never detached itself so far from the Hindu elements of Brahmanism as the Progressive Brahmas of Bengal and Madras have done."[2] In the Punjab one of the Sadharan Samaj's missionaries seceded and established the Deva Samaj. "The founder of the Samaj is Pundit Shiv Narayan Agnihotri who was born in a town of the Cawnpore District, in 1850. He is a Gauri Brahman, educated at the Rurki Engineering College. At first he was a Vedantist, identifying the individual soul with the Universal Spirit. In 1875 he took a long step forward, uniting with the Brahmo Samaj, becoming one of its leaders in the Punjab. He felt, however, that he was born to rule, and as he could not rule he left the Brahmo Samaj in 1887, and founded the Deva Samaj. Up to 1893 he was active in propagating his views, but since then he has withdrawn from circulation much of the literature he first sent forth. The Deva Samaj is now a semi-secret religious society, with no public preaching or disputation. Its books, pamphlets and newspapers are confined to the use of its members. This is the more remarkable as the founder, Pandit Agnihotri, as he is called, is an eloquent and magnetic speaker, both in English and Hindustani. Here are some of the sayings of the Pandit: 'I am free from sin.' 'I am a ship of hope and a leaven for elevating nations.' 'All who live a life of secular carelessness or attach themselves to any other religions will perish, both body and spirit.' Dr. Griswold sums up the teaching of Agnihotri in a sentence, 'The new theology of the Deva Samaj is derived from the reading of Herbert Spencer's First Principles and other works of the English empirical and evolutionary school.' And so it comes to this that the leaders of this new religious movement are only pupils of Herbert Spencer."[1]

---

[1] Mitchell, *Hinduism, Past and Present*, pp. 242–244.

[2] *The Brahmo Samaj, etc., Religious Reform*, Part IV, p. 75.

The great society in the Punjab, however, is the Arya Samaj, founded by Dayanand Saraswati, the son of a Gujarati Brahman, who was born in 1825, and becoming dissatisfied with popular idolatry, left his father's home and wandered over northern India as a fakir, seeking knowledge and salvation. He became increasingly convinced that the true hope for his countrymen lay in a return to the teachings of the Vedas, and some time before 1860, he "came to a strong determination to give his life fully to the restoration of his countrymen to their former state of happiness and prosperity."[2] He soon began disputations with the Hindu pundits, seeking "to persuade them to abandon their old teaching, accept nothing but the Vedas, and join him in leading their countrymen back to their former state." Failing to persuade the pundits, and also failing of success in his next plan of establishing schools where the pupils were supported and taught gratuitously, he adopted the plan of travelling about, teaching and establishing Samajes. He died in Rajputana in 1882. The creed which the Arya Samajes, which he founded, hold, is in brief as follows:

1. There is but one God. He is without body, omniscient, happy, true, without beginning and without end, self-existent, omnipresent, holy, and we must worship only Him.

---

[1] *Makhzan I Masihi*, Oct. 1, 1903. See supplement to this chapter, pp. 335–356.

[2] Neeld, *The Arya Samaj*, p. 2.

2. The Vedas came from the Gyan of Ishwar. They are without beginning, and were revealed to man through Rishis of ancient times.

3. There are three things which had no beginning and will have no end; God, Souls, Matter. Souls and matter come out from God and are subject unto Him.

4. The four Vedas are the only authoritative books and they came from God by verbal inspiration.

5. Eternity is divided into four periods or ages. The three eternal things act during these periods. We are now in the fourth one, which began 1,960,852,984 years ago, and will end 2,333,227,024 years hence. Then there may be an intermission, after which the huge machinery will be set in motion, and we shall start in at the beginning of a new eternity.

6. God exists in two states—one passive, comatose, devoid of attributes; the other active and manifest.

7. Sin can be predicated only of the actual sinner. All men cannot be called sinners. If they had retained their knowledge of the Veda and lived according to its directions there would not have been sin. All suffering is the result of sin, and is punishment therefor. There is absolutely no escape from the consequences of sin, but also good works will meet with certain reward.

8. Prayer should be offered five times daily to God, and is of two kinds; for worldly good, and for deliverance from every bodily desire.

9. Obedience to God and a life lived in consonance with the Vedas will produce salvation, and salvation is deliverance from transmigration.

10. By conforming to certain principles and to the requirements of the Veda, as to daily life, a person may attain unto a better birth. These principles are:

(*a*) God is the origin of all true knowledge and all discoveries which are from that true knowledge.

(*b*) God is the creator of the world, is incorporeal, omniscient, omnipresent, happy, holy, and we should worship only Him.

(*c*) The Vedas are the books of true knowledge, and it is the duty of Aryas to read them and teach them to others.

(*d*) We must always be ready to give up untruth and accept the truth.

(*e*) All our acts must be performed according to the Veda.

(*f*) The special object of this Samaj is to help others in both bodily and spiritual matters, and to make such improvements or reforms as may be beneficial to all.

(*g*) We must live with love to others according to our religion.

(*h*) Advance must be made in knowledge, and ignorance must be banished.

(*i*) Aryas should rejoice not only in their own prosperity, but also in the welfare of others.

(*j*) Persons performing duties for the public good must be subservient to others. In duties which concern our own persons we should be independent.[1]

---

[1] Quoted with some abbreviations from Neeld, *The Arya Samaj*, pp. 4–6.

In the Arya Catechism of this society, God is defined as "The Universal Soul, the Almighty Lord, the fountain of all true knowledge and the primeval cause of all things knowable, who creates the world independently." Idolatry is denounced. It declares that it is not sanctioned by the Vedas, and that it "is a folly that blunts one's mind and faculties and never induces him to make onward and spiritual progress, but tends to contempt and scorn being thrown at Hindus by the foreigners." Religion is defined as "content, returning good for evil, resistance to sensual pleasures, abstinence from illicit gain, purification, coercion of the organs, knowledge of the Vedas, knowledge of the supreme spirit, veracity, freedom from wrath. To obey the commandments of God, to do acts which do not conflict with reason, justice and fairness, and the truths of the Vedas and the Shastras, is true religion. It is such as should be embraced by the whole world."

It will be evident from these statements of the Aryas' doctrines that they are set upon an exaltation of the Vedas as the great source of authority. "Dayanand declared that he was not an independent thinker, but a follower of the Veda." [1] The ten conditions which must be met by any revelation claiming to be from God are so framed in the Arya Catechism as to admit the Vedas alone. These are three of them:

"It should not instruct us to believe in a mediator, saviour or prophet who pretends to secure us from heaven or hell.

"It must be inspired in the language which is not spoken in any country lying on the surface of the earth.

"It embraces no historical and biographical events." [2]

And the catechism proceeds to declare: "The Vedas are the only infallible revelation which can be tested by the ten aforesaid criterions." Another of the criteria specified is that the revelation should contain the germs of all the true sciences. The Aryas put themselves forward to prove that the Vedas do anticipate modern science and invention, the railway, the steamship and the telegraph. [3] To sustain themselves they are forced to principles of interpretation and allegorizing as arbitrary and unreasonable as those used by the Babis of Persia. This is easier for the great majority of the Aryas because they are ignorant of Sanskrit, and cannot read the Vedas except in Dayanand's translations. Religionists with mechanical theories of inspiration, such as are held by the Aryas and the Mohammedans, and who yet cannot read their sacred books, are always the most bigoted and fanatical zealots. And the Aryas have been noted for years for their intolerance, their vituperative speech, their violent and bitter hostility to Christianity, and also to the Brahmo school, as well as to orthodox Hinduism, which declared Dayanand's views unsound at a great convocation of learned Brahmans in Calcutta,[1] but which does not spend much strength on resisting the Arya Samaj, because it has found that the Aryas do not intend to practice what they preach, or to attempt to reform themselves until the whole Hindu mass can be reformed, and thus reform cost nothing.

---

[1] Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, p. 530.

[2] *The Arya Catechism*, p. 18, Meerut, 1888.

[3] Forman, *The Arya Samaj*, p. 51.

The Aryas, unfortunately, have shown themselves no more courageous and consistent in the practice of their principles of reform than the Brahmos. Dayanand denounced caste as the creation of Brahmans and a great evil; but he said that a Hindu might not eat from the hand of a Christian or Mohammedan, because in the composition of their bodies there are bad smelling particles.[2] Dayanand contended that one could not be a Brahman because of inheritance, but that a Brahman is such by his excellent character, works, or knowledge; but the Aryas do not follow this view, and some years ago when four members of the Brahmo Samaj of the Punjab publicly broke their caste, the fiercest onslaught upon them was made by the Aryas, and when they submitted and by the disgusting ceremony prescribed reconciled themselves to the Hindu community, the Aryas "showed a joy almost hysterical in its intensity and expression."[3] "The Arya Samaj," says Dr. Clark,[4] "professes to be a reforming body. No institution or abuse is more scathingly denounced by its members than caste. They are fully alive to its evils, detest it with their whole hearts, denounce it most unsparingly, and would have nothing whatever to say to it—in their speeches, only, however, be it clearly understood. They draw a vital distinction between principle and practice.[1] The cheap luxury of talking against caste they indulge in to the full, as for lifting their little fingers to battle seriously with its evils—that is quite another matter." Even in the Samaj meetings caste reigns supreme. Before judging the Aryas too harshly in this matter, however, it would be well for us to recall our own evils which we endure passively because we deem their cure hopeless even while we denounce them. How quickly, for instance, political corruption would be crushed in Pennsylvania if it were not for the thousands of religious people who bitterly condemn it with their lips, and then in the very spirit of the Arya Samaj, vote for it like slaves at the polls![2]

---

[1] Mitchell, *Hinduism, Past and Present*, p. 246.

[2] Forman, *The Arya Samaj*, p. 35.

[3] *The Principles and Teachings of the Arya Samaj*, Lecture VII by Bhai Lakhsman Singh, edited by H. Martyn Clark, p. 16.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

But inconsistency and insincerity and cowardice in politics in Pennsylvania do not excuse the same evils in a religious reform movement in Calcutta or Lahore, however much they should temper our speech in speaking of them. And these qualities do mark the Arya Samaj. It rests all on the Vedas, and fails to teach them in its large school in Lahore, which it calls the Anglo-Vedic School. It boasts of Sanskrit as the divine tongue, and knows less of it than the missionaries know. It denounces Hindu superstitions and requires a return to Vedic ceremonies, and yet as a Hindu school-teacher said in 1890, "The history of the Samaj for the last ten years or so, presents no instance in which any important member ever deviated from the ordinary orthodox course and observed the ceremonies enjoined in the Vedas on the occasion of marriage and death."[1] Further, the Aryas speak much of the rights of women, but they do not act upon their principles, and their doctrine of the wrong of second marriages but of the propriety of Niyog or temporary marriage compact, permeates their system, as Mr. Forman says, with moral corruption and makes it "a rottenness in society."[2] And lastly, while one of their fundamental principles is constant readiness to give up untruth and accept truth, as an actual fact the Aryas are particularly "pledged not to investigate truth, but to support what they have accepted (in joining the Samaj) no matter from what motive, as true."[3] If in saying these things I have seemed to speak with less sympathy of the Arya than of the Brahmo Samaj, it is because the former has been inspired with a venom and malignancy not prominent in the latter, and if more vigorous than the Samajes of the Brahmo movement, is also more hostile to the only source from which alone can come the realization of the hopes they profess to entertain and in the case of many profess, we must believe, with honest desire.

---

[1] "The social reformer possesses, as Carlyle has it, a prehensile tail. He returns home from his meeting or lecture in full panoply of Occidental ethics and political catch words 'up to date,' to cast off all these alien swaddling bands as easily as he divests his shapely foot of its patent leather covering, and his person generally of other incumbrances that interfere with his free enjoyment of home comfort. He performs, moreover, all the ceremonies at births and deaths required by the customs of his caste, keeps his brother's widow at the orthodox servitude, and marries off his daughter at eight years old, provided he has no bridegroom ready for her at seven. . . . In these circumstances there is practically no breach in domestic life caused by the intellectual advance of the master of the home." Reform does not necessarily mean, accordingly, any decrease of illiteracy or change of position among women or any actual change of life in men (*General Report on the Census of India*, 1891, Blue Book, C. 7181, pp. 212f.).

[2] The Aryas are like our Socialists. "So far as consistency is concerned the Socialists have an advantage over the Anarchists and the Tolstoyites. For the former set comparatively small store by individual counsels of perfection, demanding instead a change of system. There is no inconsistency in a socialist gaining or retaining wealth. In a state of war, he would argue, we must go armed, and he who renounces his possessions simply disarms in the face of the foe. Change the system, he argues, and make it impossible for great disparities of fortune to exist. But there is at least one personal obligation that even a socialist will confess—that of fraternity. And yet there is nothing more notorious than that the average partisan socialist is factious and intolerant." ("Confessions of a Social Reformer," *The Independent*, August 22d, 1901, p. 1966).

In his pamphet on the Arya Samaj, the Rev. Henry Forman, after analyzing the doctrine and describing the spirit of the Aryas, deals with the question of their power and the right missionary attitude towards them. "What has been the secret of their success? In answer we might refer to the fact that Aryanism urges the giving up of certain religious and social customs among the Hindus which are felt by a large and growing class to be a shame and disgrace to their country, and yet it saves men thus ashamed of the old from accepting a new religion taught by foreigners, thus appealing to their national pride; also the speciousness of general and indefinite claims, such as that the members of the Samaj are bound together for the sake of mutual help and self-improvement, very much as is urged for secret societies in other countries. But while these and other reasons no doubt have weight, I believe that the real reason that such members who feel that orthodox Hinduism has been weighed and found wanting, find a refuge in the Arya Samaj, as also in the Brahmo Samaj or in European infidelity or in so-called ' Free Thought '—is in that universal trait of sinful nature pointed out centuries ago by Him who ' knew what was in man,'—that ' men loved darkness rather than light.'

---

[1] *The Principles and Teachings of the Arya Samaj*, p. 9.

[2] Forman, *The Arya Samaj*, p. 44.

[3] *Principles and Teachings of the Arya Samaj*, pp. 15f.

"In this also we find the explanation of their hatred of Christianity. And they have made their opposition the more active and bitter because in activity and bitterness they find their only reason for existence, and their only food for nourishment. For all their distinctive marks are negative or combative, none positive. . . . The question as to how we should deal with the Aryas finds a ready answer. Since their very existence is founded upon and finds nourishment in combatting the teachings of others, to enter into a discussion with them, especially in print, is to nourish and strengthen them. They know this well, and so are always anxious for an opportunity for debate; and have printed and scattered broadcast many arguments held by Dayanand and others with Christians, Hindus and Mohammedans.

"If their controversial books and preaching were eliminated, not one person would hear of them where now hundreds talk about them. I am convinced that the controversies into which some have entered with them have been an unhappy mistake—that, however much they have been worsted, they gain influence and adherents thereby among those who are capable of joining them.

"Again debate blocks the progress of the truth in their hearts. For it excites the prejudices which are already so strong as to make the acceptance of the truth almost impossible." [1]

It is impossible to say how extensive the influence and membership of the various Samajes is at the present time. "According to the census of 1891, there were in India ten years ago, 39,952 Aryas, including men, women and children, the United Provinces returning 22,053 and the Punjab 16,275. For 1901 the census for the United Provinces returned 65,282 Ayras, an increase of 43,229 during the decade. This is a remarkable advance. The numerical increase has not been so great in the Punjab, the census for 1901 returning 9,105 males over fifteen, not counting women and children. Thus the numbers of the followers of Swami Dayanand, including men, women and children, must at present amount for all India to 80,000 or 90,-

---

[1] Forman, *The Arya Samaj*, pp. 63f.

000. Such is the result of the first quarter of a century of work on the part of the Samaj." [1] Dr. Murdock's estimate, published in 1893, cited figures even then rather old, which gave the number of Brahmo Samajes in India as 173, fifty of which were New Dispensation Churches. But the movement represents far more than might be inferred from the small number of Samajes and members. It is the evidence of a great stream of discontent flowing through Hinduism.[2]

---

[1] Griswold, *The Ayra Samaj*, p. 11. See Supplement to Ch. VI., pp. 335–342.

[2] "Here in the mountains everything is beautiful and the outlook from this point over the lovely Dehra Valley on to the plains beyond the Sewalik Hills is well nigh incomparable. In some respects it is a kind of prophecy or type of the spiritual outlook in India. To appreciate the beauty one must ascend and look out from the heights of the promises of God. The scenery from these heights is always beautiful. The heart is made strong. Faith is increased. Hope looks out with joy upon the fertile plains and we can almost see the harvests ripening for the glad reapers. There has perhaps never been a time when we have worked with so much of hope and joy. Never perhaps have such numbers been added to the Church, or, if not added to, yet brought into such relation to the Gospel as to promise large increase to the Churches. It is, however, true that the opposition of caste Hindus and Moslems is stronger than ever. The opposition is now organized and the methods of missionary effort are being adopted in order to counteract the work of the missionaries. The Ayra propaganda is very zealous and Arya preachers are being sent here and there to endeavour to undo what the missionaries have done. There are many reasons for believing that this movement has arrived at its highest point of advancement and that the work of disintegration has begun. It is hopelessly divided, the progressives being unable to wait on their more conservative brethren; while the conservatives are taking fright at the course of the progressives and many are retreating towards old fashioned Hinduism. Other movements have arisen which are drawing to themselves many followers. One of these is that of the Rádha Swamis. This movement is, like all reform movements among Hindus, monotheistic, gathering to itself a good many moral precepts learned from Christianity. Another movement among Hindus in the Punjab is that of a man once a Brahman, Agnihotri by name. He talks as if he were Jesus Himself, assuming the same tone and authority as is found in the Gospels, and claiming even the words of Scripture as his own. Of course he knows nothing of atonement and unfortunately for nearly all these reformers, he lacks any true perception of the sinfulness of men. He is however working quietly and establishing boarding schools for the education of boys, who will by and by become preachers of his doctrines.

"Among Moslems the movement which has created the greatest interest is that of the Qadiani Mirza Gulam Ahmed, who claims to be the Christ of promise according to Islam. His business is to save Moslems from the irreligion, materialism and idolatry into which they have fallen, and to establish the true Islam throughout the world. He is a bitter antagonist of Christianity and yet claims to be Christ Himself, just as John the Baptist was the Elijah of prophecy. You will please note here that Dowie of Chicago is not the only claimant to be an Elijah! The attitude of this man to Christianity will be clear from the following résumé of an article published in his review, which I translate from the Urdu:

"'*External Enemies.* 1. The greatest antagonism is that of Christianity.

Western education, the tightening bands between East and West drawing their thoughts together, the terrible impact of Christian Missions upon the indefensible idolatry and superstitions of the ancient religions and their debased modern expressions, the certain working of the Spirit of God in the minds of men—these and other influences have shot seam after seam of division through Hinduism, have forced men, who would have been content to grovel in the old religions, out into such day that they blush for shame, and have drawn other better men to see better things and to long after them.[1] Besides the Brahmo and

---

This antagonism shows itself in the following forms: (*a*) In its Schools, where thousands upon thousands of Moslem youth are made indifferent or atheistic: (*b*) Their preachers pervert and destroy the faith of the simple minded villagers: (*c*) Moslem homes are set on fire by the teaching of Zenana preachers: (*d*) Their hospitals are doing a work which no one has yet done in the world: (*e*) In famine seasons they feed thousands and so draw them from the True Way: (*f*) Through their influence with the rulers the missionaries get many people under their influence and so make them apostates: (*g*) By their newspapers and monthly tracts and their books they destroy thousands.'

"So much for Christian Missions. I will not follow him through other influences inimical to Islam, among which are those of the colleges, courts of justice, railways, etc. The inevitable conclusion is that the presence of Christians and missionaries in India promotes a speedy overthrow of the Moslem religion. From it all we draw the conclusion that the methods and agencies now being used to advance the cause of Christianity are accomplishing good. The whole fabric of native society, Hindu and Moslem alike, is being mightily affected by the Gospel. The very zeal of our adversaries proves the power of truth among the people. The Heights of Promise watered by the showers of divine grace, not only enable us to see the beauty of the prospect, but in the cheerful valleys and broad plains below, we can see the green fields full of hope for the harvest in the near future" (Letter from the Rev. E. M. Wherry, D. D., written from Landour, Sept. 4, 1901).

[1] Prior to the departure from Mysore of Mr. V. P. Madhava Rao, C. I. E., the new Dewan of Travancore, the missionaries of the province congratulated the Dewan elect on his elevation and wished him good-bye. Mr. Madhava Rao in reply said:—

"Gentlemen, you know well how great is my admiration for the English civilization, which means Christian civilization, which has done so much for India. It is the fashion sometimes with some of our young men, and I think they are to some extent right, to say that everything that Christianity may bring to us is to be found, more or less in our own religious books. But they forget that our religion had lost much of its vitality and had failed to influence conduct either personally, socially or politically. It is to the impact of fresh civilization, and the operation of vivifying and vigorous ideas, that we owe the reawakening that is to be found from one end of India to another. It is to Christian influences that we are indebted for the revival of the Hindu religion in the form of the Brahmo Samaj, and there have been other revivals also more or less over the country. Even as regards the European civilization and progress, it is, I believe, no less an authority than Benjamin Kidd who says that the impelling force of the modern progress is to be found in the cardinal principles of Christianity. As I said before, as far as India is concerned, we should have been moving in the old lines the Arya Samajes which have been described, there are some which have borrowed the terminology of Theosophy, and Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky were for a time conspicuous in a Theosophical propaganda, which attracted some who otherwise would have followed some other line of reform, or become disciples of some diluted form of Hinduism. The form in which Theosophy is interesting Hindus seems to be merely a type of Vedantic philosophy.[1] To criticise these particular movements which we have been considering would be easy. Their superficiality, their ignorance and even scorn of history, their inheritance of pantheistic taint, their hasty appropriation at second hand of reckless and soon forgotten criticisms of Christianity,—whether Christian history, Christian doctrine, Christian faith in prayer and miracle, or Christian ethics,—which have been born and soon buried in the West, their inconsistency, their false dealing with their own traditions and their own hearts, their compromises, their raw and irrational psychology, and their indefinite and self-contradictory philosophies, their abiding Hindu unveracity of mind[2]—and a score of other defects, weaknesses and vices,[3] could

---

and in the old grooves but for the new ideas brought by the missionaries. I will instance only a few points regarding which our conceptions have been recast and elevated in the light of the new religion. At least these ideas could not have been got in such an emphatic form from our own religion and our own past civilization. Where can we find ideas about the sanctity of human life, about the dignity of man, and about equality of all men before the Law but in the Christian Scriptures, made familiar to us in the English Laws under which we live, and in the philosophy and poetry of the West? Another idea that we owe to Christianity is the respect due to women. For all these we owe a debt of gratitude to the missionaries. They have been the pioneers of education in this country. They have brought us fresh ideas, they have given us higher conceptions of life and our duties and responsibilities as citizens and as men.

"It only remains for me to wish every success to the missionaries in the noble and godly labours in the cause of the moral and spiritual regeneration of this land" (*Indian Witness*, April 21, 1904).

[1] Monier Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, p. 526; *Church Missionary Intelligencer*, August, 1885, pp. 569–579.

[2] "Popular Hinduism has never yet been forced into admitting openly any necessary connection with morality. It has sanctified a good many rules of life and conduct which make for holiness and devotion, but the ethical Hindu reformer, who insisted on the paramount necessity of a moral object and reason for his beliefs, has had to leave the high sacerdotal pale. That righteousness is better than sacrifice has not yet been openly acknowledged by orthodox Hinduism; its ultimate teaching points directly, not to a moral Providence of any kind, but to Pantheism, which means the divine impersonality, and has no ethical basis." (Lyall, *Asiatic Studies*, First Series, p. 83).

[3] *Papers for Thoughtful Hindus*, No. 11, "The Defects of Brahmoism," by Lal

easily be pointed out, apart from their common display of the one radical weakness of failing to supply the only thing that will save pantheists who are reaching out to a pure theistic faith from dropping back into the abyss from which they are struggling up,—namely, the touch of a human hand, which is yet also the clasp of God. Old Hinduism had the conceptions of atonement for sin, and divine incarnation. Brahmoism rejected these and the great truths of which they were the shadows, and spurning the outstretched hands of the true Saviour who alone is able to hold men and nations up from the gulf, and lead them on to know the living and true God,[1] has been slipping back into the great swamp from which it came. That the Reform movement as a whole has not ended thus has been due to the constant influx of fresh influences molding the thought of India, and weakening every

---

Behai Dey; No. 2, "The Supposed and Real Doctrines of Hinduism," by N. Gorek; Bose, *Brahmoism.*

[1] *The Brahmo Samaj, etc.*, *Religious Reform*, Part IV, p. 102. "At first the Brahmists attempted to hold by the Vedas, but this involved them in sundry inconsistencies, and the more advanced section appears to have staked its creed upon pure a priori assumptions of a just and benevolent deity. They abjure the 'gross materialism' of ancient religions, they reject dogmas and traditions, and desire their disciples to look at the objects round them in the world for evidences of divine power, intelligence, and mercy. Their principal leader declares that 'the physical sciences give us better and higher conceptions of God and His government of the world than we could otherwise possess.' 'Few will deny,' he says, 'that the material universe is a great religious teacher, that the sublime and beautiful in Nature exercise a vast influence on the mind.' That the world around us is a great religious teacher, and that religious men feel awed and subdued by the aspect of Nature, are obvious truths; but many persons who judge only by history, observation, and experience, would flatly deny that these feelings necessarily make for righteousness, or that the physical forces and processes of the universe prove the divine benevolence. If any one considers closely the nature and complexion of religions which have encompassed the hearts of great nations, and reviews their origin and progress, it is easy to perceive that a faith which contains mere pious fervent sentiments and high moral lessons has never, as such, taken hold of an entire people. Such a faith has usually been preserved, in all ages of culture, by the refined intellectual minority, with a distilled aroma of the popular creed, just sufficient to indicate its origin. But Dr. Newman was right in saying that religion, properly so called, has hitherto been synonymous with revelation, that it has ever been a message, a history, a vision. And, in point of fact, the Brahmists have made no substantial progress, probably because the sect can appeal to no authoritative warrant or prescriptive sanction, while throughout the greater part of India experience and observation of the natural world tell directly against the assumption that the deity is either just or benevolent" (Lyall, *Asiatic Studies*, First Series, pp. 89f.). "Brahmoism, as propagated by its latest expounders, seems to be Unitarianism of an European type, and, so far as one can understand its argument, appears to have no logical stability or locus standi between revelation and pure rationalism; it propounds either too much or too little to its hearers" (*Ibid.*, p. 158).

year the grasp of the old religions upon the minds of the educated classes.[1] The Samajes have not been left thus to live always on the first impulses which produced them. The forces which created them grow mightier and mightier every year, and while the Samajes themselves constitute no permanent movement of any great significance, they express what is a permanent movement of great significance—namely, the dissolution of the chains of a great social and religious system which it has seemed that nothing could slay. It is possible that if British influence were withdrawn from India, less would be left to testify to its presence than remains of the early Portuguese possessions and powers; but no one who knows the depth of the work done by Christian missions, and who has studied history sufficiently to perceive in it the evidence of the unconquerable power of the forces which Christian missions introduce will believe that the movements now begun will end before the living God has supplanted the 330,000,000 gods and goddesses who have usurped His place in the hearts of the Hindu people.

There is one characteristic of these reform movements which has not yet been mentioned, the element of nationalism.[2] Mr. Bose points out that a large measure of Keshub Chunder Sen's support came from a class of men who saw that Hindu superstitions were doomed, and who welcomed his work as offering something national and distinctive which would save India from its superstitions, and also from accepting what it regarded as a Western religion. And not Keshub Chunder Sen alone, but others in India as in Japan have sought to save the national pride by the invention of some eclectic faith which will break the fall of the old faiths and superstitions.[3] It is possible

---

[1] *Church Missionary Intelligencer*, January, 1901, p. 21, Art. by Sir Charles Elliott, "Missionary Work in India in the Nineteenth Century."

[2] Smith, *The Conversion of India*, p. 221.

[3] "The Arya Samaj is a Hindu sect. I am afraid it cannot strictly be called a religious sect; for it is rather a patriotic than a religious movement, a political rather than a spiritual one. It really aims not at a religious reformation or spiritual regeneration of India, but at a national unity.

"'Our friends of the Arya Samaj think,' writes one who once belonged to it and is now a Brahmo, 'that the belief in the doctrine of the infallibility of the Vedas will secure them a national unity; although it is notorious that most of them have no faith in it themselves.' It was also reported in a Lahore paper and so far as I know without any contradiction, that it is often urged by the leaders of the Arya Samaj 'that unless all the forces of the country be concentrated in one there would be no hope for Indian unity, and that reason, conscience and all should be sacrificed to secure this end.' I happened to mention that this conception of nationalism may supply the device by which Hinduism can retain many of the men who have hitherto joined the Samajes, and these men retain their Hinduism. If the great thing is to preserve a sense of national distinctness and the integrity of traditions, rather than the forms and rites of worship, an easy compromise can be made. Hinduism can rest content if those who are dissatisfied will render a purely formal acquiescence in what the ignorant require, even though in spirit and speech they depart as far from Hinduism as Calvary from Calcutta. This seems to be the drift represented by men like Vivekananda. He was one of the Brahmo worshippers in Calcutta, where he was educated in a mission college in which he learned many things about Christianity. One thing he did not learn—how to speak the truth. In a score of ways Vivekananda broke with orthodox Hinduism, but he was an apologist for its idolatry and superstitions, and an advocate of the old faith, making use of arguments, phrases, mental conceptions and moral ideals wholly foreign to Hinduism. Yet on his return to India, he was welcomed as a great benefactor, one who had done the country a great service. "We are told," said the *Indian Mirror*, "that two wealthy Zemindars of Madras have borne the cost of Vivekananda's voyage to Chicago, and we call the attention of those benevolent gentlemen to the fact that if they can arrange for a prolonged stay of the Swami in America, in order that he may preach the sublime doctrines of what we may call the Higher

this to a Punjabi Arya who is on a visit to Calcutta, and he said, 'Yes, we believe that: let reason and conscience take care of themselves, we want unity. . . .'

"The only secret of what influence the Arya Samaj has in the Punjab and the Northwest is its appeal to the national pride and prejudices and its opposition to the foreigners. A study of the Arya Samaj, I am sure will fill your heart with gratitude to God. For it is an indirect admission from heathen India of the great power that Christianity is exercising in this land. If they did not recognize that Christianity was the strongest power in India, the Arya Samaj would not have directed all its energy to oppose Christianity rather than Mohammedanism, Brahmoism and Hinduism. Their imitation of our methods of work is another testimony to the effect that they find that our methods have worked well with us in the past.

"The Arya Samaj is also an object lesson before the Indian Church of Christ as to self-support and self-propagation. If they, the votaries of a false religion, can build their own Samajes, engage their own missionaries, print and publish their own tracts and books, start schools and orphanages, certainly we, native Christians, ought to be ashamed to say that we cannot" (*The Indian Evangelical Review*, October, 1901, Art. by the Rev. B. A. Nag, "The Arya Samaj: Its History, Progress and Methods").

Hinduism, Christendom will come to realize its gross ignorance of the Hindu religion and the Hindus all gradually come to be regarded in a just light in the West." It seems not unlikely that there will be increasing room and comfort afforded in Hinduism for the disciples of the Higher Hinduism, *i. e.*, men who are Hindus in practice and who in theory borrow as much Christian doctrine and vocabulary as they wish, but who too often lack two qualities which the full acceptance of Christianity usually produces, and the absence of which makes it possible for these men to stay where they are and to say what they do,—namely, a high sense of moral honour, and a clean intellectual integrity.[1]

It is the absence of these in so many Aryas and Brahmos that makes missionaries so despondent about reaching them, and controls the attitude of many towards the Samajes. "Half-way houses," the Samajes have been called. It is an inaccurate term. In the case of the Aryas, the Samaj is a garrison of most bitter and unwearied foes, who live by controversy directed in large measure against Christianity. And in the case of the Brahmos, the door from the Samaj back into Hinduism is always open, and the return is not difficult; but to go on to Christianity demands of men what Christ has ever asked, "Take up your cross, leave all, and follow Me. Ye shall have tribulation." It is a strait way, and few there be that find it.

That in a real way the Reform Movement has helped the cause for which the mission enterprise exists is true. As Mr. Bose says, "It has been from the beginning a standing protest against polytheism and idolatry. . . . It has, since the organization of the progressive Samaj, been a standing protest against the caste system. . . . Brahmoism has to the best of its ability thrown itself into the work of social and political reform. It is doing its best to resist the tide of atheism which is flowing out specially of Government schools and colleges. It has been popularizing ideals which are foreign to the literature of the country, the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. And lastly, the universal veneration in which the name of our Lord is held in almost all circles of our educated countrymen is to be ascribed, partly at least, to the teaching and influence of the Brahmo Samaj."[2] And this general dissension among the

---

[1] Murdoch, *Swami Vivekananda on Hinduism*, pp. 68–71.

[2] Bose, *Brahmoism*, pp. 16–20; Hurst, *Indika*, pp. 501–504.

Hindus and the debate and discussion to which it has led, have done great good in contributing to break up "the solidarity of the polytheistic mass of the Hindu faith."[1] But the very help the Samaj has given is also a hindrance. "Why may we not be satisfied with this?" men ask when they reach it. The Samaj is in reality a re-adaptation of Hinduism to a new apologetic necessity. And it meets Christianity now by simply stealing its weapons and confronting it with so much of its own message as will enable the Hindu disputant to satisfy himself that he has as much as he needs of that which Christianity offers, and yet is a Hindu still. In this sense the Samajes are a real hindrance if not to the progress of Christianity, at least to the immediate growth of the Christian Church. And the work of the Samajes has been one of the effective influences in stimulating the organization of orthodox Hindu societies for the purpose of resisting Christianity and the spirit of change and reform.[2]

Out of the mouth of Keshub Chunder Sen himself, however, we may receive the sure prediction of the ultimate result. When in 1879, he delivered his address on "Who is Christ?" he declared that India was "destined to become Christian," and "could not escape her destiny." And then he added, "Gentlemen, you cannot deny that your hearts have been touched, conquered, and subjugated by a higher power. That power, need I tell you? is Christ. It is Christ who rules British India, not the British Government. England has sent out a tremendous moral force in the life and character of that mighty Prophet to conquer and hold this vast empire. None but Jesus, none but Jesus, none but Jesus ever deserved this bright, this precious diadem, India, and Jesus shall have it!" Shall He? It rests with us to fulfill that prophecy.

---

[1] "There are hopeful changes also in the far larger community beyond the Christian pale. Of such changes some perhaps are sometimes regarded as unpleasant. But we may call to mind that, in our commonest experience, many things are hopeful which, in themselves, are by no means pleasing. So it is in this case. The chief tendency around us is often called the revival of Hinduism, and is looked on with disappointment. For myself, I am more inclined to call it the attempt to read as much as possible of Christianity into the forms of the ancient faith. I regard it as the hopeful beginning of the merchant's search after goodly pearls. His search may be long; but if only it be in earnest, we know where it will end. And when the merchant is in earnest it is only natural, and it is only right, that his search should commence in the familiar scenes of his native land" (From opening address of the Hon. and Rev. William Miller at the South Indian Missionary Conference, Madras, January, 1900).

[2] Smith, *The Conversion of India*, p. 221.

Supplement to Chapter VI

The Reform Movement in Hinduism

THE ARYA SAMAJ[1]

By the Rev. H. D. Griswold, M. A., Ph. D., Lahore, India.

I. *Introduction.*

The Arya Samaj is a Theistic and reforming sect of Modern India. It is the child of Hinduism; but, unlike the mother, it aims at a universal propaganda. Hinduism, of course, is willing to absorb all the tribes of the earth and enroll them as separate castes, but the Arya Samaj is willing to accept and purify the *individual* and receive him into the Arya brotherhood, be he Mohammedan or Christian.[2] In this respect the attitude of the Arya Samaj is modern and cosmopolitan. The Arya Samaj has just been called "the child of Hinduism." It would be more correct to call it the joint offspring of Hinduism and Western thought, scientific, religious and philanthropic. The word "Samaj" means society or assembly, and "Arya" is an ancient Indian epithet meaning "noble," a name applied to members of the three "twice born" castes. The founder of the Arya Samaj thus sought to glorify his society and make it attractive by bestowing on it a name of conspicuous dignity, and one, too, clothed with patriotic associations.

II. *The Founder.*

The Arya Samaj was founded by Swami Dayanand Saraswati, a Gujrati Brahman, who was born in the year 1824, in Kâthiâwâr. He refused to give either his name or his birthplace during his life, lest he should be hindered in his work. After his death in 1883 it came out that his real name was Mul Shankar, son of

---

[1] A paper read before the Victoria Institute, January 19, 1903.

[2] At the last anniversary of the Vegetarian Section of the Arya Samaj, held in Lahore, November 30th–December 1st, 1902, several Christians were purified and received into the Arya Samaj.

Amba Shankar, a banker and revenue collector living in a village under the jurisdiction of the Raja of Morvi in Kâthiâwâr. He was brought up in the Shaiva type of doctrine. For his home life and for the account of his early wanderings and studies, we are indebted to his Autobiography first published in the *Theosophist*,[1] and the only important fruit of the temporary union of the Arya Samaj and the Theosophical Society. There are three moments of religious interest in the home life of Mul Shankar, *alias* Dayanand Saraswati—first, his revolt from idolatry owing to an experience on the night of his initiation into the mysteries of the Shaiva cult, when he saw mice running over the image of Shiva and defiling it; second, his determination to abandon the world and seek Mukti (salvation), the result of his profound grief on account of the death of his sister; and third, his flight from home at the age of twenty-one, in order to avoid the entanglement of marriage into which his parents were determined he should enter. There is no reason for questioning the essential truthfulness of the account of these early experiences. The sincerity of his revolt from idolatry, however it came about, is proved by the magnificent courage and vigour with which he afterwards attacked idolatry in its chief centres, such as Hardwar and Benares. In fact, in his attitude towards idolatry, he was an ally of Christianity rather than a foe. After his flight from home he spent about eighteen years as a Sannyâsi or religious mendicant, wandering from place to place and learning from a great variety of teachers. He first came under Vedantic influences and for a time was convinced of the identity of the individual soul and the Supreme Soul. Afterwards he became interested in the science of Yoga and deserted the Vedanta standpoint. Later on he studied the Vedas under the tuition of the blind Swami Virajananda of Mathura. His religious development may be described as a movement from Pauranic Hinduism through Philosophical Hinduism to Vedic Hinduism. He successively deserted Shaivism and Vedantism, but clung to the last to the *Sankhya-Yoga* as the philosophical point of view from which, in his opinion, the Vedas ought to be interpreted.

The last twenty years of his life may be called the period of his public ministry (1863–1883). His history during this period is a history of preaching tours throughout the length and breadth of India, from Bombay and Poona on the south to Calcutta and Lahore on the north, of public discussions with pandits, maulvies and missionaries, and of literary work. In the great centres of idolatry his usual theme was, "Is there idolatry in the Vedas?" He founded the Arya Samaj in Bombay, in the year 1875, and visited the Punjab in 1877. He died in 1883, in the city of Ajmere, Rajputana, under circumstances which gave rise at the time to the suspicion that he had been poisoned. But of this there is no clear proof.

Some account may here be given of the personality and character of the founder of the Arya Samaj. The earliest contemporary sketch known to me of the appearance of Swami Dayanand was drawn by Rev. T. J. Scott, D. D., at the *Kurkora Mela*, on the banks of the Ganges, October 29th, 1868. It was when the Swami had gone into partial "retreat" for "further contemplation and perfection of character," as one of his biographers tells us.[2]

The description reads as follows:—"In the afternoon I visited a fakeer down on the sand by the water's edge, of whose learning and sanctity I had heard in the crowds of the bazaar. I found him sitting in a little straw booth; and a splendid-looking fellow he was, with his herculean frame and massive limbs, fine oval cranium and really benignant face. He was sitting almost entirely naked, and entered at once into pleasant conversation. I found him to belong to a class of mendicants, who profess to have entirely abandoned the world, and are living in complete contemplation of the Deity. The conversation revealed in him a fine mind and well versed in the ancient lore of the Hindus. He talked only Sanskrit and our conversation was conducted through an interpreter."[1]

---

[1] October and December, 1879, and November, 1880.

[2] *Dayanand Saraswati*, by Arjan Singh, p. 23.

Swami Dayanand from all accounts was a man of splendid physique, impressive personality and great strength of will. In a word, he was a born leader of men. His manner was commanding and imperious, but he could also be gracious and suave on occasion. In debate his style is described as of the "sledge-hammer" sort. The epithet *mahâmurkh* (great fool), was often applied by him to the defenders of other faiths. In his criticism of other faiths, he was exceedingly unsympathetic, not to say unfair. There is a general impression that this characteristic of the master has descended to his followers—in other words, that the members of the Arya Samaj are not remarkable for courtesy and fairness in religious discussion. Happily, however, there has been some improvement in this matter. As regards moral character, the Swami in his autobiography is very frank and open in telling the world how he dissembled to his father after his first flight from home and how he was accustomed to the use of *bhang*, an intoxicant, during his ascetic life. I do not mention these things by way of reproach. It is far healthier and more ethical to confess these things, than, like some other teachers in India, to claim virtual sinlessness.[2]

At the same time, it must be admitted, I think, that Swami Dayanand's naïve way of referring to the duplicity which he showed to his father argues a defective sense of the "ugliness of falsehood."[3] The actual account of his meeting with his father after his first flight from home is as follows:—"No sooner had I met his glance, though then knowing well that there would be no use in trying to resist him, I suddenly made up my mind how to act. Falling at his feet with joined hands and supplicating tones, I entreated him to appease his anger; I had left home through bad advice, I said; I felt miserable, and was just on the point of returning home when he had providentially arrived; and now I was willing to follow him home again" (Autobiography). Swami Dayanand has been charged with pursuing a path of *expediency*, that is, of holding the Jesuitical theory that a good end justifies questionable means. The episode referred to above tends to support this charge.

III. *Doctrine.*

We come now to the doctrine taught by Swami Dayanand. It has already been stated that the Arya Samaj is the joint offspring of Hinduism and Western thought. As Swami Dayanand wandered up and down throughout India, he studied not only the past but also the present, not only the thought of India as embodied in Veda and Upanishad, Sutra and Epic, but also the thought of Europe as embodied especially in the devices of modern science, everywhere manifest in India, such as railroads, telegraphs and other mechanical inventions. He finally arrived at a scheme for reconciling the present with the past, the West with the East. It was something like this. The word "*Veda*" means *knowledge.* It is God's knowledge, and, therefore, pure and perfect. This transcendent and heavenly knowledge embraces the fundamental principles of all the sciences. These principles God revealed in two ways: (1) in the form of the four Vedas, which were taught to four rishis, Agni, Vâyu, Sûraj and Angira, at the beginning of Creation over one hundred billion years ago, and (2) in the form of the world of nature, which was created according to the principles laid down in the Vedas, somewhat as the Tabernacle is said to have been built according to the pattern shown in the mount.[1]

---

[1] *Missionary Life among the Villages in India*, p. 162.

[2] For example, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian, who claims to be the "Promised Messiah."

[3] Cf. J. C. Oman, *Indian Life, Religious and Social*, p. 106.

Notice the ambiguity in the meaning assigned to the word "*Veda.*" It is (1) God's knowledge, the content of the Divine omniscience, which is *one thing;* and (2) it is the collection of Aryan literature known as the Four Vedas, which is *quite a different thing.* One may believe in the Veda in the first sense, without accepting it in the second sense. The Vedas, then, being regarded as "the Scripture of true knowledge," the perfect counterpart of God's knowledge so far as "basic principles" are concerned, and the "pattern" according to which Creation proceeded, it follows that the fundamental principle of Vedic exegesis will be the interpretation of the Vedas in such a way as to find in them the results of natural science. As E. D. Maclagan remarks: "The bases of the Aryan faith are the revelation of God in the Vedas and the revelation of God in nature, and the first practical element in this belief is the interpretation of the Vedas in conformity with the proved results of Natural Science."[2] In other words, there is involved the assumption that the Vedas as "the scripture of true knowledge" must contain "the basic principles of all sciences," and accordingly that every scientific discovery and invention of modern times must be taught, germinally at least, in the Vedas. The science of the West, then, is but the realization of the scientific programme intuited by the seers of the East, over 100,000,000,000 years ago. To the ancient East belonged the faculty of seeing; to the modern West belongs the faculty of doing. The programme comes from the East; the realization from the West. Thus the West in realizing the principles laid down in the Vedas is following unconsciously the Vedic religion. A pamphlet has just come to hand, issued by the Arya Samaj, and bearing the title, *The Source of the Christian Religion is Buddhism.* Its fundamental thesis is that all religions have their source in the Vedas and that diversities in religion are due to the influence of different environments upon the primitive Vedic revelation.[3]

The principle that all the sciences have their revealed source in the Vedas is here enlarged by the further principle that all religions find their original and inspired source in the same early literature. In this way Swami Dayanand sought to render to the East the things which belong to the East, and to the West the things which belong to the West. It may readily be imagined what kind of interpretation is involved in the attempt to find in the Vedas the results of modern scientific invention such as steam engines and gunpowder, the electric telegraph and X-rays, cannon and ocean steamers. It is a highly subjective and fanciful interpretation, not recognized as legitimate by a single Sanskrit scholar, either Indian or European, outside of the Arya Samaj. It is an interpretation which disregards at will the grammatical distinctions of mood and tense, number and person, active and passive. In a word, it is interpretation in the interests of a theory, the theory, namely that the Vedas teach a pure monotheism and contain "the basic principles of all the sciences." It is as if one should attempt to find a pure monotheism and a complete programme of scientific inventions in Homer's *Iliad* or Virgil's *Æneid.* Every historical allusion in the Vedas is carefully explained away on the ground that "the Vedas being Divine revelation expound the laws of existence in its various departments, which precludes the mention of persons and places."[4]

Thus the method of interpretation is dogmatic and *a priori,* rather than historical. Indeed, there can be no more vivid commentary on the lack of the historic sense among the Hindus than the fact that the membership of the Arya Samaj embraces a large number of English educated Indians, many of whom are college-bred, and yet they accept as historical the date 100,960,853,000 years ago as the date of the giving of the Vedas, and regard as scientific that interpretation of the Vedas according to which they constitute a prophetic programme of all the scientific inventions of modern times. One remedy for this state of affairs must surely be along the line of the encouragement in the Indian universities of genuine historical study, *i. e.*, the mastery of the methods and canons of historical research, instead of the passive memorizing of untested statements. Enough has been said to show that the doctrines of the founder of the Arya Somaj are based not on the Vedas themselves, but upon an *uncritical* and *unscientific* interpretation thereof.

---

[1] Exodus 25 : 40.

[2] *Census of India,* 1891, Vol. XIX, p. 175.

[3] Compare the doctrine of "primitive revelation" held by some Christians.

[4] *The Arya Patrika,* October 19th, 1901.

So much for the Arya doctrine of the Vedas, and of their interpretation. As in every religion, so in the Arya Samaj, the "doctrine of Holy Scripture" is of fundamental import. But while Swami Dayanand's doctrine of the Vedas is exceedingly open to criticism, it is only fair to say at the same time that he has shown a sound instinct in excluding the later literature of India, *e. g.*, the Puranas and Tantras, from the canon of Sacred Scripture. If any portion of Indian literature deserves to be called sacred *par excellence*, it is the Upanishads and certain hymns found in the *Rig Veda*, notably those addressed to Varuna.

The theology of the Arya Samaj is the religious philosophy of the *Sankhya-Yoga* read into the Vedas and Upanishads. The fundamental principle of the Sankhya is the dualism of *Prakriti* and *Purusha*, matter and soul. The Yoga, or theistic Sankhya, takes one of the innumerable souls recognized by the non-theistic Sankhya and makes it the Supreme Soul. The result is a kind of trinity consisting of God, Soul (or souls) and Matter, each independent and self-existent. God is eternal, so also is each soul, so also is matter. Pundit Ralla Ram, the theologian of the Vegetarian section of the Arya Samaj, refers to this as "the universal trinity recognized by science and religion alike" and as "the most important of the doctrines of the Arya Samaj."[1]

This doctrine of three separate, eternal, and self-existent entities is of course open to grave objections from the standpoint of philosophy. If God is eternally confronted by souls and matter, of which He is not creator, and for which He is in no way responsible, the absoluteness of His sovereignty must necessarily be very seriously impaired. God becomes logically, on this theory, little more than an umpire to preside over the inexorable processes of Transmigration and Karma, a personified moral order, the apotheosis of the principle of retribution, Karma, or the law of moral causality was the God of Buddha. This law personified is the God of Swami Dayanand. While making these criticisms, one may cheerfully admit that the realism of the Arya theology has a relative justification as a protest and reaction against the extreme idealism of the Vedanta philosophy, with its exoteric doctrines of emanation and absorption and its esoteric doctrines of illusion and identity. There is also an attempt to do justice to the claims of both science and religion. As regards the freedom of the will, the Arya Samaj holds that "we are not free to will an act, if we were created by some one else. . . . In order to be free we must be believed to be eternally acting as we thought best, or as our previous *karmas* determined the course for us, receiving according to God's eternal laws, the fruits of our own good or bad deeds, and shaping in accordance therewith, and with our own hands, as it were, our future destiny."[2]

Thus, as regards the soteriology of the Arya Samaj, the great means of salvation is the effort of the individual, and for this a sufficient sphere is allowed through the doctrine of transmigration, or repeated births. Salvation is conceived as virtually an eternal process. At the last anniversary meeting of the "College" section of the Arya Samaj, held in Lahore, November 30th, 1902, the one sentiment in the address of one speaker which was vigorously applauded was the speaker's conviction that at some time or other, sooner or later, perhaps in some cases after an unspeakable lapse of time, every soul will come to that knowledge of God which constitutes beatitude. In this way, the Arya Samaj is the advocate of the "larger hope."

---

[1] "Bearing of Religion and Morality on Final Causes." *The Arya Patrika*, Lahore, December 14th, 1901.

[2] *The Arya Patrika, loc. cit.*

Ethically, there is one doctrine taught by Swami Dayanand and accepted by the Arya Samaj, which is most objectionable. This is the doctrine of *Niyoga*, which may be described as a virtual recognition of the principle of free love, sanctified by a temporary arrangement. At the very best it can only be characterized as temporary marriage.

IV. *The Order.*

Under this head will be given some information concerning the history, organization, government, worship, methods of work and statistics of the Arya Samaj. The history during the last decade is a history of *disunion*, the Arya Samaj having split up into two sections. The ostensible grounds of the split are twofold (1) differences of practice with reference to the use of flesh for food, and (2) differences in theory concerning the proper policy to be pursued in higher education. From the point of view of the first difference the two sections are called respectively the "meat-eating" party and the "vegetarian" party; and from the point of view of the second, the "college" party and the *Mahâtmâ*, or old-fashioned party. Both differences run back into a still more fundamental difference of opinion, namely, concerning the degree of inspiration and authority to be assigned to the teachings of Swami Dayanand. In this matter, the position of the College party, as the party of light and culture, is liberal, while the attitude of the *Mahâtmâ* party is conservative. The educational work of each section is carried on in harmony with its special theory. The "Cultured" party has a college at Lahore, the *Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College*, which it administers on modern lines and with a considerable degree of efficiency. The *Mahâtmâ* party, on the other hand, has an institution at Hardwar known as the *Gurukula*, in which ancient ideals of education receive the emphasis. The past decade has also been fruitful in biographies of the founder of the Arya Samaj, no less than four having been written within this period and one of them a very voluminous work.

The organization of the Arya Samaj embraces the local somaj or congregation, the provincial assembly, and (under contemplation) a national assembly for all India. The conditions of membership in a local somaj are (1) implicit faith in the Arya "Decalogue" or Ten Principles, and (2) belief in the canons of Vedic interpretation laid down by Swami Dayanand. The candidate for membership must have reached the age of eighteen. There is no special ceremony of initiation for members of the "twice-born" castes, but outsiders such as Christians and Mohammedans must undergo a ceremony of purification. The members of a local samaj are of two kinds, probationers or non-voting and approved or voting members. The period of probation is one year. The officers of a local samaj consist of a president, vice-president, secretary, treasurer and librarian, elected by the voting members. It will be observed that the officers are those of an ordinary secular association. The Provincial assembly is a representative body composed of delegates appointed by the local congregations. Each affiliated samaj has the right to send one delegate for every twenty members. Delegates are elected for three years, and there is an annual meeting of the Provincial assembly, which has the oversight of all the congregations situated within a particular province, *e.g.*, the united Provinces or the Punjab. Thus the form of Government of the Arya Samaj is clearly representative. It is not quite clear, however, whether its special type is Congregational or Presbyterian; in other words, whether the Provincial assembly is the analogue of a Presbyterian Synod or of a Congregational Union.

The weekly religious service of the Arya Samaj is held on Sunday morning, since the Government offices are closed on that day. As it is the only religious service of the week, it is a long one lasting three or four hours. Religious worship consists of the burning of incense (the *Homa* sacrifice), accompanied by the chanting of Vedic mantras, exposition of the writings of Swami Dayanand, prayer, hymns, sermon and lecture. With the exception of the use of incense, the constituents of worship are those of an ordinary Protestant service. Thus the worship is non-ritualistic and Puritan in its simplicity. Long sermons are apparently enjoyed.

In its methods of work the Arya Samaj follows the methods current among the various missionary societies working in India. It uses preaching, education, tract distribution, newspapers, etc., etc. Its methods of raising money are as follows: (1) Voting members must pay $\frac{1}{100}$ of their monthly income. (2) Special appeals are made at the anniversary meetings. Much is made of such meetings as occasions for stirring up zeal and creating a spirit of self-sacrifice. At the last anniversary of the "cultured" section of the Arya Samaj held in Lahore at the end of November, 1902, there were "two remarkable incidents. The one was the surrender of a life policy for Rs. 10,000 to the Samaj by one gentleman in the heat of the enthusiasm created by the appeal for subscriptions that was made, and which brought forth donations to the amount of about Rs. 10,000 besides this one offer. But the other was a much more remarkable incident, viz., the resolution declared by Lala Mehr Chand, B. A., to devote himself to the interests of the D. A. V. College and to work on bare subsistence, taking a vow of poverty. . . . A notable start in this direction was made by the example set by Lala Hans Raj, B. A., Principal D. A. V. College."[1]

There are two classes of preachers, honorary and paid. The honorary preachers are local, the paid are itinerant. The first class consists of men in regular employment as clerks, pleaders, teachers, physicians and other business men, mostly English-educated and many of them college-bred. On the other hand, the paid preachers give all their time to the work of preaching, and are, as a rule, educated only in the vernacular. The salary of a paid preacher ranges from Rs. 12 to Rs. 60. It is interesting to note that the "cultured" party emphasizes *education*, while the *mahâtmâ* party emphasizes *preaching*. Each section of the Arya Samaj maintains a number of high schools and orphanages, and also several newspapers both in English and in the vernacular.

We come finally to the statistics and future prospects of the Arya Samaj. According to the census of 1891, there were in India ten years ago 39,952 Aryas, including men, women and children, the United Provinces returning 22,053 and the Punjab 16,275. For 1901 the census for the United Provinces returned 65,282 Aryas, an increase of 43,229 during the decade. This is a remarkable advance. The numerical increase has not been so great in the Punjab, the census for 1901 returning 9,105 males over fifteen, not counting women and children. Thus the numbers of the followers of Swami Dayanand, including men, women and children, must at present amount for all India to 80,000 or 90,000. Such is the result of the first quarter of a century of work on the part of the Arya Samaj. Such is the monument which Swami Dayanand has secured for himself through his disciples.

---

[1] *Punjab Observer.*

As regards the future of the Arya Samaj it is difficult to play the prophet. It is undoubtedly the most popular theistic and reforming movement in India to-day. In the matter of female education, emancipation of women, temperance and other reforms, it is in the line of progress. It also ministers to the patriotic spirit through its insistence that the Vedas are the original source of all the religion and science of the world. It accordingly appeals strongly to "Young India" as the party of patriotism and progress. It contains many earnest and good men who sincerely desire the welfare of their country. It keeps in close touch with orthodox Hinduism through the fact that comparatively few members of the Arya Samaj have broken caste. Will it ultimately be reabsorbed into the abyss of Hinduism or will it advance to a more rational and enlightened position? The future alone can answer these questions.

V. *Select Literature on the Arya Samaj.*

Veda Bhâshya. (Commentary on the Vedas.)

Veda Bhâshya Bhûmikâ. (Introduction to the above Commentary on the Vedas.)

Satyârtha Prakâsha. (Exposition of the Vedic religion and refutation of all the modern faiths.) The three above-mentioned works (in Hindi) are all from the pen of Swami Dayanand Sarasvati, and constitute the authoritative literature of the Arya Somaj.

Dayanand Sarasvati, pp. 167–182 of Professor Max Mueller's "Biographical Essays," Vol. II, Reissue, 1898.

The Arya Samaj and its Founder, Ch. IV of "Indian Life, Religious and Social." By J. C. Oman, London, 1889.

The Brahmo Samaj and the Arya Samaj. By F. Lillingston, London, 1901.

The Arya Samaj: an Outline Study. By Wilbert W. White.

The Arya Samaj, its Teaching and an estimate of it. By Rev. Henry Forman, Allahabad, 1889.

The Principles and Teaching of the Arya Samaj. Six lectures by Pundit Kharak Singh and Dr. Martyn Clark, 2d edition, Lahore, 1887.

Exposure of Dayanand Sarasvati's Deliberate Falsification of the Rig Veda. By Rev. T. Williams, Rewari, 1893.

The Dayanandi Interpretation of the word "Deva" in the Rig Veda. By H. D. Griswold, Lodiana, 1897.

Pandit Dayanand Unveiled. By Pundit S. N. Agnihotri of the Deva Dharma.

The Niyoga Doctrine of the Arya Samaj. By Ruchi Ram Sahni, M. A., Lahore, 1897.

The Problem of the Arya Somaj. By H. D. Griswold in the *Indian Evangelical Review*, January, 1902.

The Arya Samaj; its History, Progress, and Methods. By Rev. B. A. Nag, in the *Indian Evangelical Review*, October, 1901.

PUNDIT AGNIHOTRI AND THE DEVA SAMAJ[1]

By the Rev. H. D. Griswold, Ph. D., Lahore, India.

Introduction.

In the Anarkali Bazar, Lahore, the leading faiths of the Punjab jumble and clash together. Here within a limited area are to be found temples and places of worship belonging to Hindu, Mohammedan, Sikh, and Christian, as well as to the various reforming sects such as the Arya Samaj and the Brahmo Samaj. A little to one side in a secluded quarter is situated the *Deva Ashram* or headquarters of the sect founded by Pundit S. N. Agnihotri and called by him the *Deva Samaj.* The membership of the Deva Samaj is small, probably less than one thousand. Is it worth while, one might ask, to pay any attention to so small a sect? Let it be remembered, however, that the Deva Samaj is only in the sixteenth year of its existence, and further that the membership of any society is to be judged by quality as well as by quantity. Then, too, we ought to remember that every instituted religion has begun in the same way, a teacher finding a few disciples and impressing his spirit upon them. There is nothing more interesting in the world than an earnest teacher surrounded by a band of earnest disciples and conscious of a mission to humanity. On more than one occasion such a teacher with such a band of disciples has changed the history of the world. As we shall see later on, Pundit Agnihotri makes claims for himself and for his religion. He thus challenges his generation either to accept or to reject him. A clear statement of his claims together with some account of the society founded by him would thus seem to be the indispensable condition of a rational estimate of the movement. The categories under which the subject might be treated are furnished by the literature of the society itself. They are three, namely, the *Deva Guru* or founder of the movement, the *Deva Dharma* or doctrine, and the *Deva Samaj* or society. Only the first two topics will be formally discussed in this paper.

---

[1] A paper read at the North India Conference of Christian Workers, September 16–24, 1903.

I. THE DEVA GURU.

Shiv Náráyan Agnihotri was born in 1850 in the village of Akbarpur, Cawnpore District, United Provinces. He was the eldest son of Rameshar Agnihotri, a Gauri Brahman of that place.[1]

At the age of eleven he was betrothed to Lilavati the daughter of a Kanauji Brahman. Five years later he entered the Engineering College at Rurki, where he read for two years in the overseer grade, and passed in the first class. While at Rurki he manifested for a time distinctly *bairagi* tendencies, so much so that his wife was very fearful lest he should leave her and become a *fakir*, although he was only seventeen or eighteen years old. Towards the end of his course at Rurki S. N. Agnihotri came under the influence of an unnamed sage (*buzurgwar*) who taught the Vedanta doctrine of the identity of the individual soul with the Universal Soul. Into his order both he and his wife were initiated in 1871 as disciples. This represents the Vedanta period in the life of Pundit Agnihotri. It was at Rurki that his interest in social reform was born. He gave up idolatry and banished the purdah system from his household as well as several other customs of orthodox Hinduism. During the interval after his graduation in 1868 up to 1873 Pundit Agnihotri served successively as sub-overseer in the Muttra District, acting master in the Rurki College, railway overseer in the Bahawalpur State, and teacher of surveying at Rurki. At the end of this period (Nov., 1873) P. Agnihotri accepted the post of drawing master in the Government School, Lahore, in which city he has lived ever since, *i.e.*, for the last thirty years.

In Lahore P. Agnihotri was introduced to the doctrines of the Brahmo Samaj through discussions which he had with a Brahmo Pundit who taught him Sanskrit. He found himself in sympathy with the social reforms advocated by the Brahmo Samaj. Hence before very long he deserted the Vedanta point of view and along with his wife identified himself with the Brahmo Samaj. In 1875 Pundit Agnihotri became a minister of the Punjab Brahmo Samaj and Editor of the

---

[1] For the early life of S. N. Agnihotri see "*A short biographical sketch of the life of Lilavati the beloved wife of S. N. Agnihotri.*" Lahore, 1882, Urdu.

Biradar i Hind. He remained in fellowship with the Brahmo Samaj from 1874 to 1887, thirteen or fourteen years, during which time he was four years (1878–1882) an honorary preacher and five years (1882–1887) a regular preacher of the Brahmo Samaj. In order to become a regular preacher, he resigned his post as drawing master (Dec. 15, 1882), and became a Brahmo *Sannyasin* (with the new name *Brahmabad i Satyanand Agnihotri*). Under the influence of Major Booth-Tucker he established a *Brahmo Sena* or Brahmo Army in imitation of the Salvation Army. It was during the Brahmo period of his life that Pundit Agnihotri wielded from all accounts a very large influence in Lahore. He was an eloquent and magnetic speaker. Wherever he was advertised to speak the hall would be crowded. His voice was heard on all questions of social and political reform.

But gradually the entering wedge of friction began to divide Pundit Agnihotri from his fellow Brahmos. He felt that he was born to rule, and in fact he is a natural leader of men. He is said to have often uttered the words: "I am born to command, not to obey." People had hung upon his eloquence, and this condition of things does not ordinarily make for humility. His fellow Brahmos, on the other hand, were apprehensive lest he should assert his superiority and declare himself a *guru.* Then besides there were differences as to matters of administration and conduct. Pundit Agnihotri's wholesale adoption of Salvation Army methods did not commend itself to the Brahmo Samaj. For these and other reasons Pundit Agnihotri seceded from the Brahmo Samaj, taking with him a fair number of followers and organized a new society on the Queen's Jubilee Day, Feb. 16th, 1887, to be known as the *Deva Samaj* or Divine Society. It is to be noted that the grounds of the split were not doctrinal, although, as we shall see, doctrinal differences were not slow to emerge afterwards. The further history of the Deva Guru is closely interwoven with the doctrine and polity of the Deva Samaj, and so will be given in other connections.

As the result of this sketch we see that the life of Pundit Agnihotri attaches itself to three places, Akbarpur the place of his birth and home training, Rurki the seat of his education, and Lahore the scene of his life-work.

II. THE DEVA DHARMA.

From the above sketch of the life of Pundit S. N. Agnihotri it is clear that he has passed through four or more stages of religious development. He was trained up at home in popular Hinduism, probably of the Saiva type. This represents the Akbarpur period (1850–1866). During the Rurki period (1866–1873) he deserted popular Hinduism for Vedantism; while in the Lahore period (1873-1903) he has successively shifted from Vedantism to the Brahma Dharma and from the Brahma Dharma to the Deva Dharma, and as we shall see later on, there have been very considerable changes of doctrine within the Deva Dharma itself. In fact, we have to distinguish between two stages in the history of the Deva Dharma, an earlier stage lasting from 1887 to 1893, and a later stage running from 1898 to 1903. Between the two there is a kind of *transition* period from 1893 to 1898, the period covered by the libel case *Chanda Singh versus S. N. Agnihotri.*

A. The Earlier Period (1887–1893).

For this period the sources of information are comparatively abundant. They consist of (1) a confession of faith in ten articles, (2) three newspapers, namely, a weekly vernacular the *Dharma Jivan*, a monthly vernacular the *Zamima Dharma Jivan*, and a monthly paper in English known as *The Conqueror*, (3) numerous books and pamphlets containing the teachings, hymns, lectures, etc. of the Deva Dharma, as well as its published criticisms on other religions, particularly the Arya Samaj, and (4) the testimony of those who severed their connection with the Deva Samaj before 1893. It has just been said that the literature of the earlier period is comparatively abundant. It would be more correct to say that it *was* comparatively abundant, for after 1893 as much as possible of the literature of the earlier period was withdrawn from circulation.

In answer to the question, *What do the Deva Dharmis believe?* we have the creed of the earlier period in ten articles, as follows :—

(1) " They believe in *God as Supreme Being*. One without a second creator, supporter and preserver of the whole universe; All-wise, Omniscient, Omnipotent, Merciful, Just, Holy, All-love, All-joy, Saviour, Lord, Friend, Guide, Father, Mother, Life and Heaven of the Soul.

(2) " They believe in *the immortality of the human soul*, and consider it necessary for it to find salvation in this world by its liberation from sin and by obtaining purity and *Deva Jivan* (Divine life) and its heavenly and eternal blessings, and to serve and glorify God by self-surrender and unity with His will in every thought, relation and action of life.

(3) ' They also believe that, after having obtained purity, the soul becomes able to see God, to hear His Divine voice, and to realize Him through the spiritual senses and enjoy Him and His heavenly blessings by various spiritual faculties, and being possessed by His *Deva Shakti*, to rise above all spiritual afflictions in this world.

(4) " They believe every such person to be a rebel against God, and a sinner, as has not received *new life* or *conversion*, and leads a life of worldliness in defiance of God's will and in opposition to His divine attributes, thus making his soul a prey to carnality and sins.

(5) " They believe that sinners can get *new life* upon the conditions prescribed by Deva Dharma, and that they are in need of being disciplined and trained by the righteous persons filled with the Divine Spirit (*Deva Shakti*) with a view to attain to complete purity and *Deva Jivan*.

(6) " They believe the teachings of Deva Dharma and its ideal of human life as *a special Divine Dispensation for mankind* and its Teacher and Apostles as the true servants of God and man, and also as a means in the hands of the Supreme Lord (who is the giver of Salvation) to bring away souls from their sinful course, and give them the heavenly blessings of *Nawa Jivan* (new life), *Mukti* (Salvation) and *Deva Jivan* (Godly life), and bring them to the kingdom of God.

(7) " They believe the teachings of *Deva Dharma* and the truths contained in the books on it as Divine revelation, but do not confine divine truths and spiritual teachings exclusively to any particular book or Spiritual Teacher. They revere, appreciate, and recognize the spiritual teachings of every revealed book or religious Teacher or Guide, *so far as they coincide with the ideal and teachings of the Deva Dharma.*

(8) " They believe that it is their duty to expose all kinds of sin and untruth for the purpose of doing away with them, and of creating a hatred against them in men, to convert people from sin, to make them partakers of new-life, purity and *Deva Jivan*, to establish *Deva Parivara* (Divine family) on this earth, to honour the government of the country, and to help, according to their means and opportunity, in the cause of every public good.

(9) " They believe that every man and woman from any caste or nation whatever has an equal right to the blessings coming from the teachings of *Deva Dharma*, *Deva Jivan* and *Deva Parivara*, and recognize every true follower of Deva Dharma, of every nation or race, as a true member of their Brotherhood,

and consequently spurn the restrictions of caste, thinking them injurious and sinful.

(10) "They respect every religion, religious Teacher, Prophet, Guru, or Saint, but believe that the intercession of any prophet or inspired individual, or the blood of any holy teacher, or bath in any river, pilgrimage to a sacred place, or death therein, lip-worship of God or of any deity without having received new life, the performance of certain outward ceremonies, or the imitation of any deeds of virtue, does not enable man to obtain Salvation and *Deva Jivan* (italics mine)."

So reads the first official creed of the Deva Samaj. Like the creeds of the Brahmo Samaj and of the Arya Samaj, it consists of ten articles. It is rather diffuse. The religion of which this is the creed is called the *Deva Dharma, i. e.*, Deva Religion. When Pundit Agnihotri left the Brahmo Samaj, he, in order to have a distinctive name for his religion, substituted the word "*Deva*" in place of the word "*Brahma*." What is the meaning of the word "*Deva*" as used by the Deva Samaj? It is evidently a key word, since it reappears in all sorts of compounds. The word *Deva* is an ancient Vedic word cognate with the Latin *Deus* and means "God." The name for God in the first period of the Deva Samaj is *Paramadeva, i. e.*, Highest Deva. *Devattra* is the nature of God, godliness or holiness. Sinful man through conversion may obtain *Nava Jivan* or "new life," which is the first step towards the attainment of the fullness of the *Deva Jivan, i. e.*, the life of God or Divine Life. Those who have received the new life and so are become "partakers of the divine nature" (*devattra*) may receive a new name compounded of *Deva*, if men, and of *Devi*, if women. For example, Lala Devi Chand received the new name Prakash Dev and Ram Jawahir Mall the name Mangal Dev; while the daughter of the late Lala Beni Parshad, sub-engineer, Lahore, was known after her conversion to the Deva Dharma as Prem Devi. Thus, while there is only one *Paramadeva* in the older theology of the Deva Dharma, there are many *devas* and *devis, i. e.*, men and women who have become partakers of the *Deva Jivan* or "life of God" and the *Deva Shakti* of "power of God." Accordingly the relation between *Deva* and *Paramadeva* is much the same as that between *atma* and *Paramatma.* The family consisting or a *deva* and a *devi* together with their children is called a *Deva Parivara*, the society of believers is called *Deva Samaj*, and the universal church of the future will be known as the *Deva Raj*,[1] or "Kingdom of God."

Thus the Deva Samaj claims a universal mission. In article VI of the creed we read that the Deva Dharmis regard "the teachings of *Deva Dharma* and its ideal of human life as *a special Divine Dispensation for mankind.*" In harmony with this view caste is rejected as "injurious and sinful," and it is asserted (Article IX) that every man and woman, from any caste or nation whatever, has an equal right to the blessings coming from the teachings of *Deva Dharma, Deva Jivan*, and *Deva Pariwar.*" There is also a vision of "the universal church of the future," the *Deva Raj* or "Kingdom of God."

The creed under analysis may be characterized as "*theological*," it has a doctrine of God, a doctrine of man, a doctrine of salvation, and a doctrine of Holy Scripture. (1) God is *a personal God.* To Him are assigned the usual attributes, both natural and moral. After the Brahmo style He is called both "Father" and "Mother." In article VI God is declared to be "the giver of salvation." (2) Under the anthropology of the creed, the human soul is declared to be *immortal.* Apparently a natural, inherent immortality is asserted. Transmigration, as we know from other sources, is rejected.[2] The *sinfulness* of man is implicit throughout the creed, being everywhere assumed. Thus it is declared to be necessary for the human soul "to find salvation in this world by its liberation from sin" (Article II). Those who have not received new life or conversion and lead a life of worldliness in defiance of God's will are declared to be sinners and rebels against God (Article IV). People are to be converted from sin (Article VIII). Souls are to be turned away from their sinful course (Article VI). But, in the third place, the *dignity* of human nature is asserted first as strongly as its sinfulness. Man's freedom is an implicit postulate, man is capable of receiving "new life." (*Nava Jivan*), "the life of God" (*Deva Jivan*), "the power of God" (*Deva Shakti*). And so in this new estate "the soul becomes able to see God, to hear His Divine voice, and to realize Him through the spiritual senses," and hence to "glorify God" and "enjoy Him." Distinctions of caste which brand some communities as possessing less dignity than others are repudiated. Immortality is the crowning mark of the dignity of man. (3) Coming now to the soteriology of the creed, we note that salvation (*mukti*) is defined as "liberation from sin" and not as deliverance from repeated births. God is "the giver of salvation," but the Teacher and apostles of the Deva Dharma are "means" in the hands of the Supreme Lord for turning souls from their sinful course and giving them the blessings of new life. New life is thus given to sinners "upon the conditions prescribed by the Deva Dharma." Those who have received "new life" need also to be disciplined and trained by "righteous persons filled with the Divine Spirit (*Deva Shakti*) with a view to attain to complete purity and *Deva Jivan*." The emphasis upon the "new life," the "life of God" in the soul, is a point of contact with the New Testament. (4) The doctrine of Divine Revelation is found in Article VII. It reminds us at first sight of the teaching of the Brahmo Samaj. But the doctrine of revelation expressed in this article, while professedly broad and liberal, is really a very high doctrine. Note in order the points. (*a*) The Deva Dharmis believe "the teachings of the Deva Dharma and the truths contained in the books on it as *Divine revelation*." (*b*) "But do not confine divine truths and spiritual teachings exclusively to any particular book or spiritual teacher." This looks broad and liberal. But observe that (*c*) "they revere, appreciate, and recognize the spiritual teachings of every revealed book or religious Teacher or Guide, [only] *so far as they coincide with the ideal and teachings of Deva Dharma*." This is practically as high a doctrine of revelation as is held by Christian or Mohammedan. For according to it the Deva Dharma revelation is made the standard of all religious truth.

---

[1] Compare, *The Census of India*, 1891, Vol. XIX, pp. 179–181, by E. D. Maclagan.

[2] See "*Punar-Janam yane Tanasukh Ki Tardid*," 1899.

In this first official creed of the Deva Samaj the doctrine of the *Deva Guru*, "Teacher of God" or "Divine Teacher," while disguised and implicit, can nevertheless readily be made explicit. The teachings of the Deva Dharma, both oral and written, emanate from the Deva Guru, and they are declared to be Divine Revelation, the test and standard of all religious truth. The Deva Dharma is the creation of the Deva Guru, and "sinners can get new life [only] upon the conditions prescribed by the Deva Dharma." The Deva Dharma is declared to be "a special Divine Dispensation for [all] mankind." How great must the Deva Guru be who is at once the author of the *Deva Sástra* and the founder of the Deva Dharma!

Similar claims, more explicitly stated, are found in the literature of the early period. Thus in the *Dharma Jivan*, 4th Oct., 1892, Pundit Agnihotri writes concerning himself: "I am free from sin."[1]

In the same paper, dated 26th Nov. 1892, he says concerning the Deva Guru (*i. e.*, concerning himself) that "he and his Mission are not two things but one; he is the special manifestation and example of the life of holiness."[2]

---

[1] "Main khud páp se pák hún."

[2] "Wuh aur us ká mission do chiz nahin balki ek hain. Wuh khud devat ki zindagi ká kháss zuhúr aur . . . us ká namúna hai."

It is a common saying that "Christ is Christianity." Here we have a parallel saying that the Deva Guru is the Deva Mission. Again in the *Dharma Jivan*, 4th Oct., 1892, he writes: "My mission is unique. The special purpose of my appearing is a purpose in harmony with the order of nature and a purpose the fulfillment of which is necessary both for the uplifting of this country and for the spiritual welfare of the whole world." [1]

Another statement is "I am a ship of hope and a leaven for elevating nations." This reminds us of the Mirza Qadiani's doctrine of the *kishtie Nuh* or Ark of Noah. Both men alike claim figuratively to be a "Noah's Ark" for the salvation of mankind. The doctrine of the person of the Deva Guru is thus a high one. The Deva Guru is a person of universal significance, because he is (1) the founder of the absolute religion, (2) the author of a Scripture which is the test of truth in all other Scriptures, and (3) the supreme manifestation and example of the life of holiness and godliness.

B. The Transition Period (1893–1898).

The boundary between the earlier and the later period in the history of Deva Samaj is marked by the libel case *Chanda Singh versus S. N. Agnihotri.* It began towards the end of 1893 and was not settled before 1898. This is a notable episode in the history of the Deva Samaj. The original ground of the libel case seems to have been trivial. There appeared some remarks in Pundit Agnihotri's paper the *Dharma Jivan*, to the effect that a man who cannot see with physical eyes is not good for much in the matter of spiritual vision. This was aimed at Chanda Singh, a blind pleader of Ferozepore, who straightway demanded an apology. This not being given, Chanda Singh sued the author of the attack for defamation of character. Pundit Agnihotri made a counter charge, and the case dragged on for five years before it was settled. It is not the purpose of this paper to go into the merits of the case. There is one fact, however, connected with the trial which is of some interest. Gurmukh Singh at present the leader of the Deva Samaj in Ferozepore, and according to all accounts one of their best and strongest men next to Agnihotri, was Chanda Singh's *wakil* at the beginning of the case. Gradually however he was so influenced by the earnestness of the Deva Samaj men and by their good deportment in the case that he threw up the whole business, refusing to plead Chanda Singh's case any further, and before very long he became a member of the Deva Samaj.

For the purpose of this paper the importance of the case lies not in its merits but in its consequences. The long drawn out trial (1893–1898) must have interfered very seriously with the work of the Deva Samaj. Pundit Agnihotri seems to have reasoned thus: "If this is the result of public controversy, I will henceforth have none of it." At any rate the Deva Samaj soon becomes a semi-secret religious society with no public preaching or disputation. The literature of the earlier period is withdrawn as far as possible from circulation and, with few exceptions, all newspapers, books and pamphlets are confined to the use of members.

C. The Later Period, 1898 to the Present time.

We have already seen that the earlier period of the Deva Dharma (1887–1893) was represented by an official creed in the form of a *theological* decalogue.

---

[1] "Mera mission makhsús hai. Mere záhir hone ká káss maqsad hai, ki jo maqsad *nature* ke intizám ke muwafiq hai aur jis ká púrá honá kyá is mulk ke uddhar aur kyá kul dunyá ki ruháni bhalái ke liye zarúri hai."

It is interesting to note that the official creed of the later period takes the form of an *ethical* decalogue. The theological decalogue of the earlier period is given as an answer to the question, "What do Deva Dharmis *believe?*" Whereas the ethical decalogue of the later period is given in answer to the implied question, "What does a *Shraddhalu* or candidate for membership in the Deva Samaj vow to *do?*" The answer is as follows:—

(1) "He shall not take bribes or be dishonest in any way in his profession, calling or occupation.

(2) "He shall not commit theft.

(3) "He shall give no evidence that defeats the ends of justice.

(4) "He shall not suppress payment of any debts incurred or withhold anything entrusted to him.

(5) "He shall not gamble.

(6) "He shall not waste his powers by idleness.

(7) "He shall not commit adultery, unnatural crime, or self-abuse.

(8) "He shall not take any sort of intoxicants (wine, opium, bhang, charas, tobacco, etc.), barring certain right occasions (*e. g.*, when advised to use them by proper medical authority).

(9) "He shall not eat flesh or anything made of flesh, barring certain right occasions (*e. g.*, as described under 8).

(10) "He shall not kill any sentient being barring certain right occasions, (when, for instance, he is obliged to use the right of self-defence)."[1]

The difference in point of view between the *theological* creed of the first period and the *ethical* creed of the second is enormous. There has evidently been "creed-revision" with a vengeance. But the full extent of this creed-revision is hard to determine, since the literature of the second period is mostly for private circulation within the Deva Samaj. The sources of information open to the author of this paper for the theology of the period 1898–1903 are as follows:—(1) Certain pamphlets printed for public circulation including, (a) "*Binash aur Bikash: do Atal Niyam*," 1899, (b) "*Bigyan mulak Mat, aur Zindagi Ka asl Maqsad*," 1900, (c) "*Dev Samaj: Teachings, Training, Objects and Work*, 1900 (d) "*Shraddhiya Kumari Doctor Prem Devi Ji Ka Mukhtasar Jivan Charit*," 1901, (e) "*Sri Dev Guru Ji Ka Mission, Mukhalifat, Dukh, Jang aur Fatha*,"[2] 1901, and (f) "*Insan aur us ki sab se barhkar zimmawari*," 1902. (2) Five articles published in the *Arya Gazette*, Lahore, in the issues March 5, 12, 26, April 30 and May 21 on the general subject of the doctrines of the Deva Samaj. These articles are from the pen of Lala Lajput Rai and are based upon the pamphlets above mentioned, the testimony of Lala Brij Lal a late apostate from the Deva Samaj, and personal researches made by the author in Lahore, Ferozepore and Ambala.

As an introduction to the theology of the later period of the Deva Samaj, an outline of three important pamphlets will now be given. (1) "*Binash aur Bikash: do atal niyam*" (1899), *i. e.*, *Dissolution and Evolution: two fixed Laws.* The pamphlet begins with a parable, the parable of the vegetable world. Living seeds sown at the proper season in the proper soil will germinate and develop, putting forth root and stalk, branch and leaf, flower and fruit, and so fulfilling the purpose of their existence. This illustrates *Bikash*, "evolution" or "development." Whereas the same seeds, if sown at an unsuitable season or in unsuitable soil will come to nothing, and will serve only to illustrate *Binash* or "destruction." The one set of seeds come within the operation of the forces of evolution (*Bikashkari shaktian*) and live; the other set, within the operation of the forces of dissolution (*Binashkari shaktian*) and die. So much for the parable. In the application every man is to ask himself seriously whether his life is under the operation of the forces of evolution or the forces of destruction. Above all other knowledge every man ought to seek the knowledge of his own nature and of the two universal principles of *Binash* and *Bikash*, with which he has to do. Man's nature is so corrupt through the domination of animal passion that the flowers and fruits of the higher life cannot appear in it. From the point of view of the higher life all are dead,[1] and they will remain dead until they pass from under the operation of the forces of Dissolution into the sphere governed by the forces of Evolution.

---

[1] See "*Dev Samaj: Teachings, Training, Objects and Work.*" pp. 5–6, Lahore, 1901.

[2] A reprint of articles published in the *Dharma Jivan* during the earlier period with characteristic editorial changes.

So much for the contents of the pamphlet. We may read between the lines and make explicit two doctrines which are left implicit: (*a*) *Conditional Immorality.* St. Paul in 1 Cor. 15, used the similitude of the seed which grows and assumes a new form, in order to illustrate the doctrine of a new spiritual body. Pundit Agnihotri uses the cognate fact that of a number of living seeds some grow while others die to illustrate, if not to prove, his doctrine of conditional immortality. The living seed, in order to grow, requires the right soil, season, air, and light. In like manner the life of man requires a suitable environment if it is to develop a higher and abiding life. (*b*) *Outside of the Dev Samaj there is no salvation.* Salvation is defined in biological terms. It is evolution, growth. In "the wilderness of this world" the Deva Samaj is like a garden, in which the lives of men may be planted as seeds with the full assurance that they will blossom and bear fruit, since all the conditions of growth are there present. Or, to drop the figure, the Deva Samaj furnishes an environment and the only environment which is suitable for the development of the "higher life."

(2) The second pamphlet to be examined is called *Bigyan mulak mat, aur zindagi ka asl maqsad* (1900) *i. e., Science-founded religion, and the true meaning of Life.* It begins with the mention of certain scientific terms, nature, science (*bigyan*), fact (*haqiqat*), and fixed laws (*atal gawanus*). The apparent multiplicity of nature has been reduced to a unity through the discovery by science of two fixed laws, which govern all things and bind all things together, namely *Vikasha* (evolution) and *Vinasha* (destruction). Science is universally praised, because it is the sphere of fact, and not of fiction (*kalpana*). If religion is to be founded on fact, and not on fiction, it must be founded on science, *i. e.*, on the two supreme principles of science, namely, the principles of Evolution and Destruction. The Deva Dharma alone is *Vigyana-mulak* or science-founded, because founded on these two supreme principles. All other religions without exception are *Kalpana-mulak* or fiction-founded, because built upon the shifting sand of human conjecture, fancy and hypothesis. And since the Deva Dharma is founded upon the rock of scientific truth, its doctrine is the true religious doctrine and its leader is the true leader (*asl Hadi*). The distinguishing characteristic of the Deva Guru is that he has made an absolute discovery in the realm of religion, and so has given to religion a sure foundation and philosophy.[2] Knowledge of the

---

[1] "Ala zindagi ke lihaz se sub murda hain," p. 10.

[2] "Us asl hadi ki khususiyaton men se yih us ki ek nihayat azim ush-shan khususiyat hai ki us ne is dunya ko mazhab ki bunyad aur failsafa di hai ki jo aj tak kisi ne nahin di, aur jo sachmuch Science par mabni hai," p. 8.

two fundamental principles of Evolution and Dissolution introduces one into a *new light* (*nai roshni*), and a *new world*, and gives one *new eyes*. From the vantage ground of such knowledge one can estimate all other religions at their true value as not only fanciful (*khiyali aur wahmi*), baseless (*be bunyad*), and unprofitable (*be-sud*), but also injurious (*nuqsan dih*). To be without this knowledge is to be blind (*andha*), ignorant (*be-sudh*), foolish (*murakh*) and misguided (*gumrah*).

The last five pages of this pamphlet deal with "the true meaning of life" *Zindagi ka asl maqsad*. This is a subject of a science known as the *Science of Life* (*Jivan Viaya*), which is the highest of all sciences, since it treats of the spiritual welfare of man. Man is compounded of two things, body (*sharir*) and living force (*jivani shakti*); or, to use the older term, the spirit of life (*Jivatma*). And now we come to a passage (p. 9) which must be literally translated, it is so important. It runs as follows:—"If through being entangled in secular affairs there be carelessness concerning the development of the life of the spirit (*Jivatma*), or if through the adoption of the creed of this or that fiction-founded faith there be the voluntary choice of error, then one day the spirit too (*Jivatma*) like the body will perish ('*Lop ya nash ho ata hai*'). And when the spirit no longer exists, then nothing of man exists. This is the doctrine which rests upon the universal Principles of Evolution and Dissolution [as a necessary inference], and which no prophet of the fiction-founded faiths has to this day seen or known or declared."[1] Here we have finally an explicit statement of the doctrine of conditional immortality, which is declared to be the unique discovery of the Deva Guru. All who live a life of secular carelessness or attach themselves to any other religion except the Deva Dharma will perish, both body and spirit. This is the supreme doctrine of Pundit Agnihotri's Science of Life. One great excellence of the Deva Dharma, according to this pamphlet, is that it is free from the fanciful, unprofitable and injurious creeds which characterize all other religions. The source (*Chasmah*) of the doctrine and discipline of the Deva Dharma is the Deva Guru (p. 12.) The manifestation of the life-giving light and power of this religion has according to the course of evolution appeared in the life of a certain personality.[2] The Deva Guru is accordingly a *life-giver* (*jivan-data*) p. 10. But union with him and with his society is the necessary condition for receiving life. And only as each man receives new life from the life-giving Deva Guru is the true meaning of his life fulfilled.

(3) The third pamphlet to be analyzed bears the title, "*Insan aur us ki sab se barhkar zimmawari*, 1902, *i. e. Man and his Supreme Responsibility*. It begins with certain questions, What am I? Whence am I? Since when am I? Why am I? In what condition am I, and into what condition will I change? Such questions as these cannot be asked by the lower animals, but by man alone. The asking of such questions presupposes the possession on the part of man of a *unique faculty* (*makhsus qabiliyat*) and also guarantees the possibility of a true answer, since the being who can ask such questions must possess the means of research which are necessary to answer them. But this high prerogative of man, the *power* to ask the question, "What am I?" carries with it the *responsibility* to ask it and to ask it with infinite seriousness. The possession of this power lays upon every man the command.[3] More fully stated this command, the violation of which is pronounced an exceeding great fault, includes four things. (*a*) Know

---

[1] "Aur jab jivatma hi na rahe, to phir insani koi hasti hi baqi nahin rahti. Yih wuh tatt hai ki jo Bikash aur Binash ke alamgir asulon par mabni hai, aur jis ko kalpana-mulak maton ke kisi hadi ne aj tak nahin jana aur nahin batlaya."

[2] "Is dharam ki jívan dáyak joti aur shakti ká zuhúr Bikash ke silsile ke muwáfiq kisi àtmá ke jivan men húá hai."

[3] "Know thyself," "Tu apne wujúd ko pahchán."

thine own *nature.* (*b*) Know thine *environment.* (*c*) Know the relations which exist between thy nature and thine environment, and (*a*) Seek to order thy life in the light of this knowledge (p. 4). Men are free to obey this command. Blessed are they that obey it.

The Deva Guru, the supreme teacher of "the Science of Life," proceeds in the remainder of this pamphlet to answer the questions put at the beginning. The total concrete being of man is like an onion. An onion consists of various layers. Remove the outer layer and the second layer appears. Remove the second and the third appears, etc. Now each different layer represents in man a different world. These worlds, although in a sense distinct one from another, are nevertheless bound together in the unity of the same being and mightily influence one another for weal or for woe. This is in answer to the question, "What am I?" It is a revival of the ancient *koshavidya* or doctrine of sheathes, *i. e.*, of different natures, animal, intellectual, moral, etc., which is found in Taittirya Upanishad.

The second question is "Since when am I?" The answer to this is found in the Darwinian Doctrine of Evolution as universalized by Herbert Spencer and others. All animal life goes back to an original germ of undifferentiated protoplasm. The development of organs and the differentiation of species is the result of evolution working through countless ages. Every animal existence has had a kind of germinal preexistence in the bodies of its ancestors, reaching back to the primeval germ. This is the answer to the question, "Since when am I?" The Deva Guru accepts the theory that the law of evolution governs the inorganic world as well as the organic, and he expounds the nebular hypothesis of the origin of the solar system. The instruments of cognition employed in the investigation of nature are three, namely perception (*mushahada*), experience (*tajriba*), and comparison (*muqabala*). Science traces things back to the nebulous state. And back of the nebuia there must have been something else, of which the nebula itself was the manifestation, and so on, apparently, in a *regressus ad infinitum* (p. 12). That we are ignorant of the states preceding the nebulous state is not to be wondered at, since our knowledge of even the world of phenomena (*zuhur*) is relative (*nisbati*), not absolute (*qatai*). Of the reality (*asliyat*) behind phenomena we neither know anything nor can know anything. Here we catch the echo of the Spencerian agnosticism. "If even in the world of phenomena," says the Deva Guru, "our knowledge is not absolute, but only relative, then how can our knowledge of that from which the phenomenal world proceeds, and in which it lives and moves, be absolute?" (p. 13). All that we can know is that the phenomenal world constitutes a system, in which everything, whether animate or inanimate, stands in relation to everything else, and all are parts of one whole.

Returning now to the question of evolution (*Bikash*) we see that animal life has gradually developed through countless generations into higher and higher forms, until it has found its climax in man. But the evolutionary process cannot be confined to the past. It has also *future* fruits to show. The working of evolution is wonderful. A mango seed is the home of living force and has implicit within it a mango tree. But unless the mango seed fall into the ground and attach itself to the proper means, it abideth alone. The dynamic union (*mel*) between the seed and the soil is emphasized. It is a picture of the union which must take place between sinful man and the Deva Guru, if man is to find life and realize his true end. Here we have an answer to the question, "Why am I?" The purpose of my being is that the upward or evolutionary forces may work in me, producing a higher and higher life and thus progressively making me to realize the true meaning of life. Finally from all this discussion four conclusions follow:—(*a*) I am, but I am a part of the universe. (*b*) I am related to everything in the universe, whether animate or inanimate. (*c*) As related to everything in the universe, I cannot but change either for the better or for the worse. (*d*) So far as I choose those relations and attach myself to those means which make for my development (*Bikash*), I become a well-wisher of myself and manifest an enlightened self-interest. By so doing I fulfill my high *responsibility* as a man. This is the true "Science of Life."

The pamphlet ends with a polemic against the theological, mythological, dogmatic, and sectarian creeds of the fiction-founded religions.

We are now in a position to summarize the later theology of the Deva Samaj, so far as it is found in the above mentioned pamphlets.

(1) *Theology*, or doctrine of God. There is no doctrine of God in the new theology of the Deva Guru. God is not denied. He is simply ignored. It is Hume's attitude towards God over again. The name of God does not occur in the three pamphlets analyzed above. The articles republished from the *Dharma Jivan* in the pamphlet "*Sri Dev Guru Ji Ka Mission*" have been edited up to date, *i. e.*, all names of God such as *Ishwar* and *Paramadev*, have been eliminated.[1]

The concept "God" is evidently regarded by the Deva Guru as "mythological," an inheritance from "the days of ignorance." In place of the theological concept "God" he would substitute the scientific concepts "life," "law," and "force." According to the latest insight of the Deva Guru men have to do, not with a personal God, but with an impersonal law, the law of Evolution and Dissolution. And he would doubtless claim that there is no loss in this substitution, but rather gain. For (*a*) men are thereby delivered from the tyranny of a personal God the reputed author of famine, pestilence and flood, (*b*) the reality imperfectly grasped under the theological concept "God" is more adequately and truly grasped under the scientific concepts law and force, and (*c*) religion is once for all harmonized with science. In this substitution of an impersonal law for a personal God the "new theology" of the Deva Guru shows affinities with Buddhism and Theosophy as well as with the system of Comte. Strictly speaking, the founder of the Deva Samaj is an agnostic rather than an atheist. He does not so much deny as refuse to affirm the existence of God, on the ground that there is no sufficient evidence for the great affirmation. The philosophical basis of Pundit Agnihotri's agnosticism is the Spencerian empiricism. Knowledge is confined to the world of phenomena. Of the reality behind phenomena we know nothing.[2]

The claim to possess such knowledge is a fictitious claim. All other religions make this claim, and so they deserve the name of "fiction-founded religions." The Deva Dharma alone, as based upon the results of Science, deserves the name "science-founded."

That this is a correct interpretation of the revised attitude of the Deva Samaj towards God is supported by the report of an interview with Pundit Agnihotri, which was published in the *Tatwabodhini* and reproduced in the *Purity Servant*, October 1st, 1903. According to this report Pundit Agnihotri says: "*I no longer believe in Brahma* [*God*]. *It is nothing but an imagination.*" And in further support of the Phenomenalism of Pundit Agnihotri there is the article published in the *Hyderabad Journal*, 24th June, 1903, in which Pundit Mohan Dev, a preacher of the Deva Samaj, speaks of "*the Evolutionary Process in Nature*" as carried on by "*The Mysterious Hand*." The Mysterious Hand behind the veil of Phenomena which shifts and adjusts the scenes, is the "Great

---

[1] For example, in the *Dharma Jivan*, 25th Sept., 1892, p. 3, we read: "Magar unhon ne apne piyare mahbub Paramdev ke hukm aur us ki di hui Devat ki zindagi ke liye wafadar rahne ke liye mazkura i bala sukhon aur sukh ke saman aur dunyavi kull namwari aur izzat ko tark aur qurban kiya." This is reproduced in the pamphlet "*Sri Dev Guru Ji ka mission*," 1901, p. 18, in the following form. "Magar unhon ne apne mission, yane Jivanvrat ke liye wafadar rahne ki gharaz se," wagh.

[2] See "Insan aur us ki sab se barhkar zimmawari," pp. 12, 13.

Unknown" of Herbert Spencer. Pundit Agnihotri's revised scheme has points of contact with Vedantism also. He divides reality between two worlds, the world of phenomena and the world of unknown energy behind phenomena. In like manner Vedantism has its world of *Màyà*, and behind the veil of *Màyà* the unqualified *Brahma*, concerning which not a single affirmation may be made. The theology of Pundit Agnihotri is possibly not yet in its final form. The writer of this paper ventures respectfully to suggest to the Deva Guru that he read the works of John Fiske, one of the most eminent of the disciples of Herbert Spencer, and see if he cannot adopt the *Cosmic Theism* of the disciple rather than the Agnosticism of the master.

(2) *Eschatology*, or doctrine of the future life. The Deva Guru in his "new theology" teaches a conditional survival of death. The soul is not by nature immortal. The most that can be said is that it has possibilities of immortality.[1]

That this is the correct interpretation of Pundit Agnihotri's position is proved beyond all shadow of doubt by the article which appeared in the *Hyderabad Journal*, 24th June, 1903, from the pen of Pundit Mohan Dev. The author of this article writes as follows:—

"To save the nation from this perilous situation [explained in the preceding context] various doctrines are advanced. There are those who start with the good old theory that all is good and that even evil and misery are for our good. Again some assert that man is gifted with an intuitive power which requires to be educated and informed to be able to hear the voice of God. Others again say that there is Justice in the universe and our meritorious or demeritorious actions find a corresponding recompense in different physical conditions of life. But they all believe that every man is immortal and that to whatever depths of degradation he may fall, sooner or later he is sure to rise from it even against his own will and wrong course. These are surely very consoling and hope-inspiring theories. But there is hope and hope, and a hope or faith which has no foundation in fact may prove a veritable curse and more suicidal than no such hope or faith. Now what is the fact? The fact is that man is an organized living being and like every other living organism he is governed by the laws of *Vinash* and *Vikash*; and that sin is a disease of the soul, which in thought, deed and word distorts and demolishes the inner man and renders its capacities of unfoldment and growth weaker and weaker every day, and if this course continues life becomes completely extinct. Do we not see that while many useful trees and plants thrive and bear fruit and foliage, thousands upon thousands of seeds in the same world of vegetable, in the absence of a proper environment, get completely destroyed, life being altogether extinct. Do not scientific investigations show that, while in the Animal Kingdom there has been a course of evolution, many types, which existed at one time, are now totally extinct? Does not history testify to the fact that while many nations and families have risen many have seen complete ruination? The law of continuity being an unquestionable fact, the inner life of man cannot form a solitary exception to universal nature. Therefore, immortality for every soul is a myth and a great delusion. No religious system can be scientific which has no basis in life and its law, and is unable to show that the inner organism of man is as much governed by the laws of evolution and dissolution as any other organism."

(3) *Soteriology*, or doctrine of salvation. The statement that "Immortality for *every* soul is a myth and a great delusion" means that some people survive death and have an existence beyond, while others perish both body and soul in the great change. Hence the doctrine of Transmigration is rejected,[2] and that logically; for the natural immortality of the soul would seem to be the necessary

---

[1] See "Bigyan Mulak Mat," p. 9.

[2] See "Punarjanam yane Tanasukh ki Tardid," 1899.

presupposition of Transmigration. To survive death, the soul, which is sinful and so from the standpoint of the "higher life" is "*dead*" must be "born anew," by contact with a "Saving and Life-giving Higher Power." This "Life-giver," is the Deva Guru. The seed of man's life must be sown in a proper environment, if it is not to perish utterly. This proper environment is the Deva Samaj. Salvation then, is the result of spiritual contact with the Deva Guru. It manifests itself in a "new harmonious higher life," a life of purity and goodness, over which death has no power. All this is made explicit in the three pamphlets above analyzed as well as in the article by Pundit Mohan Dev. The doctrine of *Conditional Immortality* as taught by the Deva Guru reminds one of the similar doctrine advocated by the Rev. Edward White and expounded in his volume "*Life in Christ.*" Whether Life in Christ in this sense is the doctrine of the New Testament is a mooted question, but there is no doubt that *life in the Deva Guru*, in the sense that without contact with him every one is bound to perish utterly, is a fundamental doctrine of the Deva Samaj. A certain book has profoundly influenced the thought of Pundit Agnihotri, namely Prof. Henry Drummond's "*Natural Law in the Spiritual World.*" The author begins the first chapter, namely the chapter on *Biogenesis*, with the quotation, "He that hath the Son hath Life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not Life."[1] The analogous doctrine of the Deva Samaj might be stated thus: He that hath *the Deva Guru* hath Life, and he that hath not *the Deva Guru* hath not Life. It thus appears that just as India has a Mohammedan Messiah in the person of the Mirza Ghulam Ahmed of Qadian, so it has a Hindu Messiah in the person of Pundit S. N. Agnihotri of Lahore.

(4) The doctrine of the person of the Deva Guru. A passage has already been quoted to the effect that "The life-giving light of this religion [*i. e.*, the Deva Dharma as the true and absolute religion for all mankind] and the manifestation of its power has, *according to the course of Evolution*, appeared in the life of a certain personality."[2] Pundit Mohan Dev in his article in the *Hyderabad Journal* expresses much the same thought. He writes: "Extraordinarily natured master souls appear on the stage of humanity from time to time according to the needs of the times and uplift fallen humanity. This is how humanity progresses. *This is called the Law of Evolution. It is in accordance with this Law that the founder and leader of the Deva Samaj has appeared.*" (Italics mine.) From these two quotations, one from the Deva Guru himself and the other from a prominent disciple, it is clear that the Deva Guru does not claim to be a supernatural personage. His place is under the law of Evolution, but—and this indicates his dignity—his place during his own generation is the *supreme place* under that law. He represents up to the present time the *supreme product* of evolution. That is, he has reached a point, intellectually, morally, and spiritually, which no other man has ever reached. Thus he occupies a unique position and has in all things the preeminence. He is the consummate fruit of the religious spirit. As such he is the true religious leader (*Hadi*) for all mankind, declared to be such not by the decrees of men, but by the infallible indications of the evolutionary process. The question arises, Does Pundit Agnihotri regard himself in any sense as an *Incarnation?* Yes and no. He does not regard himself as the incarnation of any God in the popular sense, as, *e. g.*, the personal and anthropomorphic deity of popular worship. But he does apparently regard himself as the highest concrete embodiment that has yet appeared of that fullness of light and power, of life and law, which seems to constitute the ultimate reality of all things.

It is evident from this summary of the later teachings of the Deva Guru that the gulf between the "old theology" and the "new theology" of the Deva Samaj is a wide one. The old theology was theistic: the new theology is agnostic. The old theology taught the natural immortality of the soul: the new theology teaches conditional immortality. From the standpoint of the Deva Guru of the new theology the Deva Guru of the old theology professed a fiction-founded faith and lived in "the days of ignorance." In the violent changes which have overtaken his theology Pundit S. N. Agnihotri may well be compared with Mrs. Anna Besant. Finally the old theology is a compound of elements derived from the doctrines of the Brahmo Samaj, the teaching of Major Booth-Tucker, and the reading of Christian books such as "*Natural Law in the Spiritual World.*" Whereas the new theology of the Deva Samaj is derived from the reading of Herbert Spencer's *First Principles* and other works of the English Empirical and Evolutionary Schools.

---

[1] 1 John 5: 12.

[2] Bigyan Mulak Mat, 1900, pp. 11, 12.